

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. XV.

JULY, 1896.

No. 3.

AUGUSTINE AND THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

BY PROFESSOR B. B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.

V.

Letter to Jerome on the Origin of Souls.

THE treatise *On Nature and Grace* was as yet unfinished when the over-busy¹ scriptorium at Hippo was invaded by another young man seeking instruction. This time it was a zealous young presbyter from the remotest parts of Spain,—“from the shore of the ocean,”—Paulus Orosius by name. His pious soul had been afflicted with grievous wounds by the Priscillianist and Origenist heresies that had broken out in his country, and he had come with eager haste to Augustine on hearing that he could get from him the instruction which he needed for confuting them. Augustine seems to have given him his heart at once. But feeling too little informed as to the special heresies which Orosius wished to be prepared to controvert, he persuaded him to go on to Palestine to be taught by Jerome, and gave him introductions which described him as one “who is in the bond of catholic peace a brother, in point of age a son, and in dignity a fellow-presbyter,—a man of quick understanding, ready speech and burning zeal.” His departure to Palestine gave Augustine an opportunity to consult with Jerome

¹ For Augustine's press of work just now, see *Epistle* 169, 1 and 13.

on the one point that had been raised in the Pelagian controversy on which he had not been able to see light. The Pelagians had early argued¹ that, if souls are created new for men at their birth, it would be unjust in God to impute Adam's sin to them. And Augustine found himself unable either to prove that souls are transmitted ("traded," as the phrase is), or to show that it would not involve God in injustice to create a soul only to make it subject to a sin committed by another. Jerome had already put himself on record as a believer in both original sin and the creation of souls at the time of birth. Augustine feared the logical consequences of this assertion, and yet was unable to refute it. He therefore seized this occasion to send a long treatise on the origin of the soul to his friend, with the request that he would consider the subject afresh, and answer his doubts.²

In this treatise he stated that he was fully persuaded that the soul had fallen into sin by no fault of God or of nature, but of its own free will; and asked when could the soul of an infant have contracted the guilt, which, unless the grace of Christ should come to its rescue by baptism, would involve it in condemnation, if God (as Jerome held, and as he was willing to hold with him, if this difficulty could be cleared up) makes each soul for each individual at the time of birth? He professed himself embarrassed on such a supposition by the penal sufferings of infants, by the pains they endure in this life, and much more by the danger they are in of eternal damnation, into which they actually go unless saved by baptism. God is good, just, omnipotent: how, then, can we account for the fact that "in Adam all die," if souls are created afresh for each birth? "If new souls are made for men individually at their birth," he affirms, "I do not see, on the one hand, that they could have any sin while yet in infancy; nor do I believe, on the other hand, that God

¹ The argument occurs in Pelagius' *Commentary on Paul*, written before 410, and is already before Augustine in *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins*, etc., iii. 5.

² *Epistle* 166.

condemns any soul which He sees to have no sin." "And yet, whoever says that those children who depart out of this life without partaking of the sacrament of baptism, shall be made alive in Christ, certainly contradicts the apostolic declaration," and "he that is not made alive in Christ must necessarily remain under the condemnation of which the apostle says that by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation." "Wherefore," he adds to his correspondent, "if that opinion of yours does not contradict this firmly grounded article of faith, let it be mine also; but if it does, let it no longer be yours."¹ So far as obtaining light was concerned, Augustine might have spared himself the trouble of this composition. Jerome simply answered² that he had no leisure to reply to the questions submitted to him. But Orosius' mission to Palestine was big with consequences. Once there, he became the accuser of Pelagius before John of Jerusalem, and the occasion, at least, of the trials of Pelagius in Palestine during the summer and winter of 415, which issued so disastrously, and ushered in a new phase of the conflict.

The Treatise on "The Perfection of Man's Righteousness."

Meanwhile, however, Augustine was ignorant of what was going on in the East, and had his mind directed again to Sicily. About a year had passed since he had sent thither his long letter to Hilary. Now his conjecture that Cœlestius was in some way at the bottom of the Sicilian outbreak, received confirmation from a paper which certain Catholic brethren brought out of Sicily, and which was handed to Augustine by two exiled Spanish bishops, Eutropius and Paul. This paper bore the title, *Definitions Ascribed to Cœlestius*, and presented internal evidence, in style and thought, of being correctly so ascribed.³ It consisted

¹ An almost contemporary letter to Oceanus (*Epistle* 180, written in 416) adverts to the same subject and in the same spirit, showing how much it was in Augustine's thoughts. Compare *Epistle* 180, 2 and 5.

² *Epistle* 172.

³ See *On the Perfection of Man's Righteousness*, 1.

of three parts. In the first of these were collected a series of brief and compressed "definitions," or "ratiocinations" as Augustine calls them, in which the author tries to place the Catholics in a logical dilemma, and to force them to admit that man can live in this world without sin. In the second part, there were adduced certain passages of Scripture in defence of Pelagian doctrine. In the third part, an attempt was made to deal with the texts that had been quoted against the Pelagian contention, not, however, by examining into their meaning, or seeking to explain them in the sense of the new theory, but simply by matching them with others which might be thought to make for it. In answer to this paper, Augustine at once (about the end of 415) wrote a treatise which bears the title of *On the Perfection of Man's Righteousness*.

The distribution of the matter in this work follows that of the paper to which it is a reply. First of all (1-16), the "ratiocinations" are taken up one by one and briefly answered. As they all concern sin and have for their object to prove that man cannot be accounted a sinner unless he is able, in his own power, wholly to avoid sin—that is, to prove that a plenary natural ability is the necessary basis of responsibility—Augustine argues *per contra* that man can entail a sinfulness on himself for which and for the deeds of which he remains responsible, though he be no longer able to avoid sin; he thus allows that, for the race, plenary ability must stand at the root of sinfulness. Next (17-22) he discusses the passages of Scripture which Cœlestius had advanced in defence of his teachings. These include two classes of texts. There were (1) passages in which God commands men to be without sin. These Augustine meets by saying that the point is, whether these commands are to be fulfilled *without God's aid*, in the body of this death, while absent from the Lord (17-20). There were also (2) passages in which God declares that His commandments are not grievous. These Augustine meets by explaining that all God's commandments are fulfilled only by love, which finds nothing grievous; and that this love is shed abroad in

our hearts only by the Holy Ghost, without whom we have only fear, to which the commandments are not only grievous but impossible. Lastly, Augustine patiently follows Cœlestius through his odd "oppositions of texts," carefully explaining, in an orthodox sense, all that he had adduced (23-42). In closing, he takes up Cœlestius' statement, that "it is quite possible for man not to sin even in word, if God so will," pointing out how he avoids saying "if God give him His help," and then proceeds to distinguish carefully between the differing assertions of sinlessness that may be made. To say that any man ever lived, or will live, without needing forgiveness, is to contradict Rom. v. 12, and must imply that he does not need a Saviour, against Matt. ix. 12. 13. To say that after his sins have been forgiven, any one has ever remained without sin, contradicts 1 John i. 8 and Matt. vi. 12. Yet, if God's help be allowed, this contention is not so wicked as the other; the great heresy is to deny the necessity of God's constant grace, for which we pray when we say, "Lead us not into temptation."

Activity Subsequent to the Palestinian Acquittal.

Tidings were now (416) beginning to reach Africa of what was doing in the East. There was diligently circulated everywhere and finally came into Augustine's hands, an epistle of Pelagius' own "filled with vanity." In it he boasted that fourteen bishops had approved his assertion that "man can live without sin, and easily keep the commandments if he wishes," and had thus "shut the mouth of opposition in confusion" and "broken up the whole band of wicked conspirators against him." Soon afterwards a copy of an "apologetical paper," in which Pelagius used the authority of the Palestinian bishops against his adversaries, not altogether without disingenuousness, was sent by him to Augustine through the hands of a common acquaintance, Charus by name. It was not accompanied, however, by any letter from Pelagius; and Augustine wisely refrained from making public use of

it. Towards midsummer Orosius came with more authentic information, and bearing letters from Jerome and Heros and Lazarus.

It was apparently before his coming that a controversial sermon was preached, only a fragment of which has come down to us.¹ So far as we can learn from the extant part, its subject seems to have been the relation of prayer to Pelagianism; and what we have opens with a striking anecdote. "When these two petitions—'Forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors,' and 'Lead us not into temptation'—are objected to the Pelagians, what do you think they reply? I was horrified, my brethren, when I heard it. I did not, indeed, hear it with my own ears; but my holy brother and fellow-bishop Urbanus, who used to be presbyter here and now is bishop of Sicca," when he was in Rome and was arguing with one who held these opinions, pressed him with the weight of the Lord's Prayer, and "what do you think he replied to him? 'We ask God,' he said, 'not to lead us into temptation lest we should suffer something that is not in our power—lest I should be thrown from my horse, lest I should break my leg, lest a robber should slay me, and the like. For these things,' he said, 'are not in my power; but for overcoming the temptations of my sins, I both have ability if I wish to use it, and am not able to receive God's help.'" You see, brethren," the good bishop adds, "how malignant this heresy is: you see how it horrifies all of you. Have a care that you be not taken by it." He then presses the general doctrine of prayer as proving that all good things come from God, whose aid is always necessary to us and is always attainable by prayer; and closes as follows: "Consider, then, these things, my brethren, when any one comes to you and says to you, 'What, then, are we to do if we have nothing in our power, unless God gives all things? God will not then crown us, but He will crown Himself.' You already see that this comes from

¹ Migne's Edition of Augustine's Works, vol. v. pp. 1719-1723.

² Compare the words of Cicero quoted above, vol. xiv., p. 467.

that vein : it is a vein, but it has poison in it ; it is stricken by the serpent ; it is not sound. For what Satan is doing to-day is seeking to cast out from the Church by the poison of heretics, just as he once cast out from Paradise by the poison of the serpent. Let no one tell you that this one was acquitted by the bishops : there was an acquittal, but it was his confession, so to speak, his amendment, that was acquitted. For what he said before the bishops seemed catholic ; but what he has written in his books, the bishops who pronounced the acquittal were ignorant of. And perchance he was really convinced and amended. For we ought not to despair of the man who perchance preferred to be united to the catholic faith and fled to its grace and aid. Perchance this was what happened. But, in any event, it was not the heresy that was acquitted, but the man who denied the heresy."¹

The coming of Orosius must have dispelled any lingering hope that the meaning of the council's finding was that Pelagius had really recanted. Councils were immediately assembled at Carthage and Mileve, and the documents which Orosius had brought were read before them. We know nothing of their proceedings except what we can gather from the letters² which they sent to Innocent at Rome, seeking his aid in their condemnation of the heresy now so nearly approved in Palestine. To these two official letters, Augustine, in company with four other bishops, added a private letter,³ in which care was taken that Innocent should be informed on all the points necessary to his decision. This important letter begins almost abruptly with a characterization of Pelagianism as inimical to the grace of God, and has grace for its subject throughout. It accounts for the action of the Palestinian synod as growing out of a misunderstanding of Pelagius' words,

¹ Compare the similar words in *Epistle* 177, 3, which was written, not only after what had occurred in Palestine was known, but also after the condemnatory decisions of the African synods.

² *Epistles* 175 and 176 in Augustine's *Letters*.

³ *Epistle* 177. The other bishops were Aurelius, Alypius, Evodius, and Possidius.

in which he seemed to acknowledge grace. Those catholic bishops naturally would understand this to mean that grace of which they read in the Scriptures, and which they were accustomed to preach to their people,—the grace by which we are justified from iniquity, and saved from weakness. While Pelagius really meant nothing more than that "grace" by which we are given free will at our creation. "For if these bishops had understood that he meant only that grace which we have in common with the ungodly and with all along with whom we are men, while he denied that by which we are Christians and the sons of God, they not only could not have patiently listened to him,—they could not even have borne him before their eyes." The letter then proceeds to point out the difference between grace and natural gifts, and between grace and the law, and to trace out Pelagius' meaning when he speaks of grace and when he contends that man can be sinless without any really inward aid. It suggests that Pelagius be sent for and thoroughly examined by Innocent; or that he should be examined by letter or in his writings; and that he be not cleared until he should unequivocally confess the grace of God in the catholic sense, and anathematize the false teachings in the books attributed to him. The book of Pelagius which was answered in the treatise *On Nature and Grace* was enclosed with this letter, with the most important passages marked: and it was suggested that more was involved in the matter than the fate of one single man, Pelagius, who, perhaps, was already brought to a better mind; the fate of multitudes already led astray, or yet to be deceived by these false views, was in danger.

At about this same time (417), the tireless bishop sent a short letter¹ to a Hilary who seems to be Hilary of Norbonne, which is interesting from the attempt made in it to convey a characterization of Pelagianism to one who was as yet ignorant of it. It thus brings out what Augustine conceived to be its essential features. "An effort has been made," we read, "to raise a certain

¹ *Epistle* 178.

new heresy, inimical to the grace of Christ, against the Church of Christ. It is not yet openly separated from the Church. It is the heresy of men who dare to attribute so much power to human weakness that they contend that this only belongs to God's grace,—that we are created with free will and the possibility of not sinning, and that we receive God's commandments, which are to be fulfilled by us; while, for keeping and fulfilling these commandments, we do not need any divine aid. No doubt, the remission of sins is necessary for us; for we have no power to right what we have done wrong in the past. But for avoiding and overcoming sins in the future, for conquering all temptations with virtue, the human will is sufficient by its natural capacity without any aid of God's grace. And neither do infants need the grace of the Saviour, so as to be delivered from perdition by it through His baptism, seeing that they have contracted no contagion of damnation from Adam."¹ He engages Hilary in the destruction of this heresy, which ought to be "concordantly condemned and anathematized by all who have hope in Christ" as a "pestiferous impiety," and excuses himself for not undertaking its full refutation in a brief letter.

A much more important letter was dispatched, at about the same time, to John of Jerusalem, who had conducted the first Palestinian examination of Pelagius and had borne a prominent part in the synod at Diospolis. With it was sent a copy of Pelagius' book which had been examined in the treatise *On Nature and Grace*, as well as a copy of that reply itself; and John was asked to send Augustine an authentic copy of the proceedings at Diospolis. Augustine took this occasion seriously to warn his brother bishop against the wiles of Pelagius, and to beg him, if he loved Pelagius, to let men see that he did not so love him as to be deceived by him. He pointed out that in the book sent with the letter, Pelagius called nothing the grace of God except nature; and that he affirmed, and even vehe-

¹ *Epistle* 179.

mently contended, that by free will alone human nature was able to suffice for itself for working righteousness and keeping all God's commandments. From this any one could see that he opposed the grace of God of which the apostles spoke in Rom. vii. 24, 25, and contradicted, as well, all the prayers and benedictions of the Church by which blessings were sought for men from God's grace. "If you love Pelagius, then," he continued, "let him, too, love you as himself,—nay, more than himself; and let him not deceive you. For when you hear him confess the grace of God and the aid of God, you think he means what you mean by it. But let him be openly asked whether he is willing that we should pray God that we sin not; whether he preaches the assisting grace of God without which we would do much evil; whether he believes that even children who have not yet been able to do good or evil are nevertheless, on account of one man by whom sin entered into the world, sinners in him, and in need of being delivered by the grace of Christ." If he frankly denies such things, Augustine would be pleased to hear of it.

Thus we see the great bishop sitting in his library at Hippo, placing his hands on the two ends of the world. That nothing may be lacking to the picture of his universal activity, we have another letter from him, coming from about this same time, that exhibits his care for the individuals who had placed themselves in some sort under his tutelage. Among the refugees from Rome in the terrible times when Alaric was a second time threatening the city, was a family of noble women, Proba, Juliana and Demetrias,¹—grandmother, mother, and daughter—who, finding an asylum in Africa, gave themselves to God's service and sought the friendship and counsel of Augustine. In 413 the granddaughter "took the veil" under circumstances that thrilled the Christian world, and brought out letters of

¹ See *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, New York ed., vol. i., p. 459, and the references there given. Compare Canon Robertson's vivid account of them in his *History of the Christian Church*, ii. 18, 145.

congratulation and advice from Augustine and Jerome, and also from Pelagius. This letter of Pelagius seems not to have fallen into Augustine's way until now (416). He was so disturbed by it that he wrote to Juliana a long letter warning her against its evil counsels.¹ It was so shrewdly phrased that, at first sight, Augustine was himself almost persuaded that it did somehow acknowledge the grace of God ; but when he compared it with others of Pelagius' writings, he saw that here, too, he was using ambiguous terms in a non-natural sense. The object of his own letter (in which Alypius is conjoined as joint author) is to warn Juliana and her holy daughter against all opinions that opposed the grace of God, and especially against the covert teaching of the letter of Pelagius to Demetrius.² " In this book," he says, " were it lawful for such an one to read it, a virgin of Christ would read that her holiness and all her spiritual riches are to spring from no other source than herself ; and thus, before she attains to the perfection of blessedness, she would learn—which may God forbid !—to be ungrateful to God." He quotes the words of Pelagius in which he declares that " earthly riches came from others, but your spiritual riches no one can have conferred on you but yourself ; for these, then, you are justly praised, for these you are deservedly to be preferred to others—for they can exist only from yourself and in yourself." And then, he continues : " Far be it from any virgin to listen to statements like these. Every virgin of Christ understands the innate poverty of the human heart, and therefore declines to be adorned otherwise than by the gifts of her Spouse. . . . Let her not listen to him who says, ' No one can confer them on you but yourself, and they cannot exist except from you and in you : ' but to him who says, ' We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.' And be not surprised that we speak of these things as yours, and not from you ; for we speak of daily bread

¹ *Epistle* 188.

² Compare *On the Grace of Christ*, 40. In the succeeding sections, some of its statements are examined.

as 'ours,' but yet add, 'Give it to us,' lest it should be thought it was from ourselves." Again, he instructs her that grace is not mere knowledge, any more than mere nature; and that Pelagius, even when using the word "grace," means no inward or efficient aid, but mere nature or knowledge or forgiveness of past sins: and beseeches her not to forget the God of all grace from whom (Wisdom i. 20, 21) Demetrius had that very virgin continence which was so justly her boast.

With the opening of 417, came the answers from Innocent to the African letters.¹ They were marred by much boastful language concerning the dignity of his see, which could not but be distasteful to the Africans. But they admirably served their purpose in the satisfactory manner in which, on the one hand, they asserted the necessity of the "daily grace and help of God" for our good living, and, on the other, they determined that the Pelagians had denied this grace, and declared their leaders, Pelagius and Cœlestius, deprived of the communion of the Church until they should "recover their senses from the wiles of the Devil by whom they are held captive according to his will." Augustine may be pardoned for supposing that a condemnation pronounced by two provincial synods in Africa and heartily concurred in by the Roman bishop, who had already at Jerusalem been recognized as in some sort the fit arbiter of this Western dispute, should settle the matter. If Pelagius had been jubilant before, Augustine found this a suitable time for his rejoicing.

S. FRANCIS DE SALES: DOCTOR OF THE CHURCH.

(*In three parts.*)

PART III.

M. D'AVULLY was the great bulwark of Calvinism in those parts; a man of high birth, position, and character. His opinion of his Ministers was greatly shaken

¹ *Epistles* 181, 182, 183, among Augustine's *Letters*.

by their unwillingness to meet S. Francis. He soon discovered that this proceeded from their inability to answer him, and after a most complete and searching examination of his teaching, he gave in his submission to the Church which sent him. This was on the 4th October, 1596,¹ a day which S. Francis always kept with special commemoration, looking on this conversion as the beginning of the death-blow to Calvinism in the Chablais. Previously had been converted a famous lawyer, named Poncet, and a certain number of others. We have no wish to magnify the number of actual conversions up to this date. We are not looking for heroism from the majority of these people. Yet little less was required from those who at this time were converted. We have already seen what to think of Mr. Bacon's "vast worldly advantages." The poorer sort were actually obliged to leave the country to find the means of livelihood. Poncet's friends renounced him, and gave out that he was possessed by devils. He had hesitated for a long time, knowing that he would lose his business, his friends, and his property (*Let. Inéd.* 39, 40). The very fewness of the conversions is itself an argument against Mr. Bacon. It is not in human nature to resist such attractions as he pretends to have been set forth. For our part, we do not assert that the country *professed* itself Catholic in the face of every contradiction. We maintain, indeed, that the real cause of conversion was the grace and truth of the Church; but we also admit that before this cause could act universally, it was necessary to remove those obstacles of fear and self-interest which have been indicated. The actual state of the case was this. At the end of the second year's preaching all was beginning to ripen towards the harvest; there was in some cases

¹ Shortly afterwards (Mr. Bacon wrongly says, previously) he was present at a conference between S. Francis and the Minister, La Faye. He admits that the report of this discussion has not been preserved, but presents us, from Gaberel, with the account of a similar one later. Any one acquainted with the style of the Saint will see at once that it is the fabrication of an adversary. Replying, *ad hominem*, we need only point to the effect on M. d'Avully, as the best testimony we possess of the real facts.

actual conviction, in others a strong and growing impression that the Catholic was the true faith ; whilst nearly all were friendly to the Saint, and prepared to listen to him. Catholicism no longer meant superstition. But there was not detachment enough in many cases to give up all that made life dear. The actual profession of the Catholic faith still meant the risk of earthly ruin. Two letters of S. Francis make clear the actual position of affairs. The first was written a considerable time earlier, and thus furnishes an *à fortiori* argument. He says (*Let.* 9) :—

One party does not wish to hear ; the other excuse themselves on the risk they would run if the truce were broken, had they made the smallest show of approval of the Catholic reasons ; which fear so holds them that they fly all they can our very conversation. There are some quite persuaded of the faith, but we cannot draw them to the confession of it during the uncertainty of the event of this truce.

A still more decisive passage occurs in a letter (*Let. Inéd.* 35) to the Duke, of this very date, which forms a suitable conclusion to our account of the first part of the mission :—

Sire, the disposition in which I now see the people of the Chablais is such, that if in the execution of your highness's holy intention, the churches at Thonon, and some other places, were restored, I hesitate not to say that in a few months almost the whole of this country would be converted. Since in the town so many are so well disposed, and the rest so uneasy in their consciences, that if the occasion offer, they will infallibly take the direction your highness wishes ; and as for the rest of the country, there have already come separately ten or twelve parishes to ask for the exercise of the Catholic religion, so that the time is come to see God praised, and the zeal of your highness effective.

We arrive now at the second two years of the mission. Mr. Bacon having prepared the way by his supposed proof of utter failure up to this point, in spite of every advantage, on account of the attachment of these people to their faith, delivers his chief attack on S. Francis. He dares to explain the undeniable fact of the complete conversion of the Chablais, by saying that, other means failing, S. Francis had "unscrupulous resort to violence." This, we say, is his chief attack ; but we have prepared our main answer to it in

our treatment of his introductory charges. Our object has been not only to bring forward the truth about these, but at the same time to show that there is no need of any further cause to explain the course of subsequent events. The internal change had already taken place. What need was there to force or bribe the people to do what they were willing and anxious to do? Instead of having, as Mr. Bacon pretends, to account for a complete and absolute change, we have simply to show the same causes producing their natural and final effect under propitious conditions.

But as we have undertaken to give a definite answer to the different heads of accusation, and as Mr. Bacon has expended on this portion of his article all the resources of his rhetoric, we will follow him step by step. His "causes" of the conversion of the Chablais may be summed up in three: severe edicts of the duke, procured by Francis; the actual use of a regiment of soldiers to force the profession of Catholicism on the people; the supreme pressure of the State, forcing them to choose between Catholicism and expatriation. We can take minor charges with these.

And first, as to the severe edicts. It is true that at the end of the second year's preaching, the Duke began to awaken to the actual position of affairs, sent for Francis to Turin, and asked him what might be done to further the conversion of the country. The measures he proposed were chiefly the restoring of the Mass, sending more preachers, and spreading Catholic worship. There is, indeed, a *mémoire* of S. Francis, which Hamon places in October, 1598, but which would seem to have been *presented* now, in which some stronger measures are proposed, as suitable to be adopted, "*après quelque temps*." But in any case this is not the place to take it, because, whether presented or not, it was not acted upon till the date M. Hamon fixes, when the country was practically converted; and we will not blink the question when we come to that time. We will only say here that its chief aim was the observance of the treaty of Nyon (1589), as to having no

exercise of Protestantism in Thonon. As to Mr. Bacon's assertion that Francis proposed "to scatter terror through the country by wholesome edicts," this is a mere invention of the anonymous author he refers to. There is no sign of it, or of anything approaching to it, in any document, and instead of furthering, it would have injured the Catholic cause. Yet this he underlines, and puts forward as representing the spirit of all the measures proposed; he returns to it again and again, and colours his whole narrative with it. But, at last, the question is not what was *proposed*, but what was *done*. All that S. Francis really obtained was an assurance of the Duke's good-will, a promise of support for more missionaries, and, what he wanted most of all, permission to say Mass in the church of S. Hippolyte, which had already been given to the Catholics to preach in. Mr. Bacon pretends that he carried out this permission in a way which took the magistrates quite by surprise, and was calculated to "scatter terror;" but it was really done in a perfectly open manner. Marsollier says he "hastened" to present his letters of authorization to the magistrates, and his intention was known all over the town. The first Mass was celebrated on Christmas Day, 1596, and thenceforward it was offered daily, and on great feasts solemnly, in Thonon. We cannot exaggerate the importance of this. We do not expect Mr. Bacon to appreciate the supernatural power of the Holy Sacrifice; but while he can scarcely call it violent persecution to perform the Catholic service, he would see, if he understood the dislike and fear with which it had formerly been regarded, that no stronger proof could have been given of the strengthening of the Catholic feeling in the Chablais, than the public celebration of Mass in the capital. About February of the year 1597, M. Favre, President of the Senate of Savoy, went to live in the neighbourhood. He conversed with the people and impressed them more by the example which in his exalted position he gave of a Christian life, than by any words he could have used. He came partly at the request of S. Francis, and of course Mr. Bacon entirely

misrepresents his visit. He places it as early as 1595,¹ pretends that M. Favre "scattered terror" in order to get the people to come to the Mass of Christmas Day, 1596, and says that his visit was in consequence of a request to the Duke from S. Francis, to send him as a Commissioner to compel the people to attend his preaching. Saint Francis really asks (*Let. Inéd.* 32) :—

That a senator might come, and call the citizens together, and in his magistrate's dress invite them to listen to, hear, sound, and nearly consider, the reasons which the preachers propose on behalf of the Catholic Church, from which they had been torn without reason by the violence of the Bernese.

This saying Mass and visit of M. Favre (who called no assembly, and did not appear in his official dress), with an increase in the number of priests, as the process of conversion advanced, were literally *all* that was done at this time beyond what had been done in the first two years. The rest was the same; summarized in the word *preaching*, but preaching in its noblest sense, by example and by word, the preaching of a saint. "By preaching," said S. Francis (*Esprit*, iii. 5), "this heresy is maintained, and it will only be destroyed by holy preaching." Words deeply to be laid to heart by all who are striving to bring back a nation to the faith. But now preaching was *heard*, now the sacrifice of the Mass gave efficacy to it, and now the stability of the work began to be secured by organization and the appointment of settled pastors.

As Saint Francis had said that many parishes were anxious to profess the Catholic religion, so now, with some security of the Duke's protection, they began. Three were organized early in this year, 1597. The ceremony of Ash-Wednesday, while it gave great offence, and nearly led to S. Francis's martyrdom, was a means of more strongly confirming the idea of sacramental grace. Immediately after this a great victory of S. Francis over Viret, the Calvinist minister of Thonon, on the question of the perpetual virginity of

¹ He is misled by the incorrect date at the head of the letter. But if he had taken the pains to read it, he would see that it was a considerable time after the conversion of M. d'Avully, Oct. 4, 1596.

Mary—a point generally admitted by the so-called Reform—with the minister's dishonest conduct on the occasion, led to the conversion of Fournier, the first syndic of Thonon, and many of the chief citizens. These wrote a letter to the Holy Father (*Let.* 23), in the name of the town; and we commend it to the attention of Mr. Bacon as another proof that S. Francis neither made nor had made any disguise of Catholic doctrine, as his observance of the ceremony of Ash-Wednesday shows that he made no disguise of Catholic practice :—

We know with what love you cherish us, but a little while ago your wandering sheep, now come back to the fold. This is certainly beyond doubt, which from the very beginning (*statim ab initio*), we have heard on the part of those who have brought us forth into the Gospel of Christ—viz., that there is on earth one Supreme Pastor, to whom Christ has so absolutely, so universally (*tam indistincte*), committed His sheep, that He clearly did not speak of some, but assigned all, and who, besides His daily instance, has the solicitude of all the churches. For we acknowledge in your Beatitude the supremacy (*principatus*), of the Apostolic priesthood, and a zeal corresponding to such an exalted station.

The Lent of this year brings us to the second of Mr. Bacon's proofs of violence; the one on which he lays the greatest stress, and in treating which he makes the strongest appeals to the imagination of his readers. We will give his own words, to show the bitterness of his *animus*. After stating, quite incorrectly, that from the time of the Saint's visit to Turin, he was helped by a great force of priests, he continues :—

But our Apostle had lost faith in such methods of evangelization, and looked for something more effective. Of any ordinary force there was no lack already in the Garrison of the Allinges, and other military posts which were under his orders, and which held the wretched country in complete subjection. But there was need of something "to scatter terror;" and our saint knew of just the instrument for the purpose, if only he could lay his hand upon it. The "Martinego regiment" was a name that had only to be whispered in all that region to make the blood run cold with horror. It was a regiment of Spanish mercenaries, that had been trained in the American wars to an exquisite delight and ingenuity in human torture.

Mr. Bacon entertains his readers with an account of the horrors which they were said to have practiced *elsewhere*, which we content ourselves with simply

denying, till some better authority be given for them than the word of Mr. Bacon or Gaberel.

Evidently the Martinengo regiment was exactly what Francis needed for his Apostolic work. What he wanted was not soldiers, but those particular soldiers. . . . At the Apostle's request this horde of devils was billeted on the towns and villages of the Chablais. . . . From this point the work of conversion was simple, straightforward, and rapid. The new missionaries showed great devotion to their work of confiscation and banishment.

As Mr. Bacon professes to make a new departure in the estimation of S. Francis, our readers must excuse us for answering seriously this extravagant calumny. It will now be no surprise to hear that S. Francis had nothing whatever to do with the coming of these soldiers. Mr. Bacon does not even produce a fragment of authority for saying that he had. Marsollier tells us that the people were astonished at their coming, and does not say a word to imply that S. Francis's surprise was less than theirs. He was absent from Thonon at the time. On his return, Marsollier says that the officers of the regiment waited on him to offer their services; but Mr. Bacon is careful to suppress the concluding words. "S. Francis only used their deference to make them live in order, and to be as little burden as possible to the inhabitants." We hear no more of them, except (and here we may thank Mr. Bacon for his description of their previous crimes) that S. Francis converted them all to a practical Christian life, so that they did, indeed, by their good example, help his missionary work. Their arrival was quite independent of his mission. It was part of a general plan for getting the Chablais gradually again in hand. It was the placing of a garrison at Thonon, such as had already been at Allinges. Far from attempting to use such means for religious ends, S. Francis was particularly cautioned to be extremely careful in carrying out his own mission. At this very date M. Favre tells him (*Let. Inéd.* 47):—

The President of the Council wishes you to continue to say Mass in S. Hyppolyte, but he does not think it good that you should have an

altar¹ carried into the church . . . so as not to give occasion to any new disturbance in a time so critical as this.

And again (*Let. Inéd.* 46) :—

While we all approve what you have hitherto done, for the rest we all agree that you must go no further without the express order of the Duke, so as not to constrain him to come to the violent remedies which would be necessary if these gentlemen committed some insolence in the form of contempt or rebellion.

Considerably later the Bernese threatened to make war on the Duke unless the Capuchin preachers, men rather bolder in their expressions and method than the prudent and gentle Saint, were commanded to desist from preaching. As to S. Francis's own principles, it would be enough to appeal to his general character ; but, fortunately, we have several distinct instances of his opinions and practice in such matters. The first, when the Governor of Allinges after the attempt upon his life, which we have mentioned above, begged him to accept an escort of soldiers. He replied :—

St. Paul and the Apostles did not employ soldiers. They used only the sword of the Divine Word . . . Luther and Calvin, on the contrary, spread their heresy by sword and fire, by force of temporal power. This is a reason for me not to act so. . . . Suffering and trust in God are of more avail than a legion of soldiers.

And we have an instance still more to the point, when there was question of some troops passing through Thonon, in 1598. Francis writes to the commandant (*Let. Inéd.* 57) : " We beseech your eminence, with all the humility possible, and conjure you by the bowels of Christ, and the blood He has shed for souls . . . that you would deign to take another route." . . . And yet we are asked to believe that, in complete violation of his principles, and with a fiendish hypocrisy, he set murderers to preach the gospel of peace. We are asked to believe that while the authorities were afraid of provoking a revolution by sending a new altar into a Catholic Church in which Mass was already said, they did not hesitate to set hell-hounds loose upon the people. And we are told that

¹ In place of a wooden one hastily patched up for the Mass of Christmas Day, 1596.

the Bernese, who would not tolerate the preaching of an earnest Catholic friar, stood patiently looking on while their co-religionists were outraged and massacred.

We may now resume our outline of the actual course of events, not thinking it necessary to delay to answer in detail Mr. Bacon's accusation of the use of bribery and seduction. What he calls by these names was merely the charitable help necessary to keep from starvation the victims of Mr. Bacon's upholders of liberty of conscience. This help soon ceased, because, as the country became more Catholic, the need of it ceased.

The bringing of the Martinengo regiment to a holy life, which was attended with many striking circumstances, produced a great effect in the country. Conversions multiplied rapidly, and the organization of parishes continued *pari passu*. Shortly after those we have mentioned, came twelve others, and parish priests began to be appointed, each at first serving several parishes. Catholic services and preaching were to be found in many places; a few zealous men joined the Saint in preaching about the country. These were supported, not "with salaries that had been pledged to the exiled Protestant pastors," but by private liberality, and by such ecclesiastical revenues of the Chablais as had been saved from the Calvinists and given in trust to the Knights of SS. Maurice and Lazarus. The ministers, who were never once interfered with by Francis or the State, convinced that the Duke was in earnest, and seeing their cause was hopeless, retired of themselves, and the field was left open to Catholic influences. It would have been impossible for S. Francis to do all the work that was now required, and he gladly attributed the marvellous success to others; but the chief glory of these, as of the earlier days, belongs to him. It was still his virtues and his preaching, his wisdom and his learning, which stirred the people to the depths, which regulated the great movement, and tempered zeal with prudence and with charity. From the beginning of 1598, the people began to come over

en masse. The Jesuits were then established at Thonon, and Fr. Humæus alone is said to have received 10,000 persons in six months,¹ a fact which remarkably fulfils the Saint's prophecy, in his letter to B. Canisius of 1596 (*Let. Inéd.* 29):—"If they are once favourable to my words, God will send a great number of skilful workmen, of your society and others. These will finish their work in a few days."

We mention, in passing, that in September of this year occurred the *only* miracle ascribed by Catholic writers to S. Francis throughout the whole four years. In the same month, the famous "Forty Hours" of Thonon were held, in thanksgiving for the Treaty of Vervins (May 2, 1598), which assured the Chablais to Savoy, and removed all fear of the Bernese. It furnishes three remarkable proofs that the country was now practically Catholic. No protest was made by the rapidly decreasing body of Calvinists, when the bishop, finding St. Hippolyte far too small for this great solemnity, took over and reconciled the great church of St. Augustine. Through the whole time of the devotion, there streamed in and out of the church processions from different parts of the Chablais, some to beg for admittance into the true fold, others to thank God for the gift of faith already received. At the end of

¹ Common report would not be proof of the number of conversions, but certainly tends to prove the number of inhabitants, and is enough, by itself, to overthrow the absurd statement of Mr. Bacon, that the whole district contained but 4,000. This was the population of the town of Thonon alone. On his own showing, what becomes of the "towns and villages of the Chablais" on which his "horde of devils was billeted?" What was the use of "the garrison of the Allinges, and other military posts?" The districts of Thonon, Ternier and Gaillard, with their eighty-four parish churches (*Opuscles*, p. 84), formed, as we have said, the most populous part of the whole province of Chablais, which contained over 60,000 persons. We have seen S. Francis speaking of the "many thousands of souls." Gex contained upwards of 22,000, M. Hamon says 30,000. We are safe in taking these figures from the census of 1848, because Mr. Bacon avers that since the days of S. Francis "a blight" has fallen on the country. The number 72,000, which is given, with the qualification, "it is said," in the Bull of Canonization, includes all the conversions affected mediately or immediately by him. The Sœur Madeleine de Chaugy says (*Vie de S. F. de S.*) he received 11,000 himself, and was the means of conversion to 60,000 others.

the ceremony crosses were solemnly erected in Thonon, and were carried triumphantly by the different bands of pilgrims to be placed throughout the whole country. We may well repeat, then, that the Chablais was now Catholic, and any subsequent action of State authority could be at most the protection of a converted country. We come now to this action of the Duke, which forms the third point of Mr. Bacon's proof of "violence," and which he presents as the real and final cause of conversion. The exact dates are of importance here. The Duke was to have attended the solemnity just mentioned, but could not arrive in time. It was determined to celebrate a second "Forty Hours," at which he and the cardinal-legate assisted. He arrived at Thonon on the 30th September. It was his first visit after the rebellion of 1594, and when he arrived within a short distance of the town, he declared his intention of punishing this crime. All were filled with consternation. M. de Vallon, the chief Protestant in the district after the conversion of M. d'Avully, went with the consistory to beg S. Francis to put himself at their head, and implore the mercy of the Duke. It was easily granted to such an intercessor; and though this fact only furnishes Mr. Bacon with an opportunity for a sneer, it was the occasion of the conversion of M. de Vallon, and of many others, previously unconvinced.

On the 1st of October, before the grand opening Mass, came the abjuration of many gentlemen of the Chablais, and citizens of Thonon, headed by the Minister Petit, a man of the greatest consideration among the Calvinists up to the moment when he declared his intention of becoming a Catholic. Early in the afternoon of the same day the Legate, attended by the Duke, returned to the Church to receive abjurations. First came a multitude from many parishes united; then a body of from 500 to 600 people. These had scarcely moved away, when other groups presented themselves, so that some had to remain ready the whole time to receive them. S. Francis speaks (*Let.* 49) of the many thousands whom the Legate actually

saw received. Of course all these had been instructed before the Duke's arrival.

On the 3rd or 4th of October appeared envoys from Berne, asking for Calvinism the same liberty in the Chablais as for Catholicism. We invite particular attention to the Duke's reply : " When you usurped this province you forced the people to embrace your new opinions ; and now that my just arms have recovered it, and almost all my subjects (*la presque totalité*) testify a desire for me to re-establish the old and true religion on the same footing as before, you should not find it strange or wrong that I, their legitimate sovereign, claim the right, if I please, to regulate the affairs of religion according to their desires" (*Ch. Aug.* p. 179). And the next day, when they pressed their petition, he said, " I agree, if you will also receive Catholic priests at Berne."

Their refusal is enough alone to condemn them as advocates of toleration. We see, then, the true state of things. Mr. Bacon carefully keeps all this out of sight, and he proportionately disfigures the final scene which occurred on the 6th of October, but which he erroneously places after the 12th. We have learnt to understand his style. The " shuddering citizens," the " Spanish butchers," the " bloodthirsty Duke," with " his inspiring genius . . . Francis de Sales," stripped of their stage dresses, become simply a public audience, in which the Sovereign, attended by his guards, declares his intentions about the country. He told them that he considered those who would not hear his preachers to be his enemies ; and declared that if they continued obstinate, he would deprive them of their offices, make them feel his indignation, and even banish them from his dominions. S. Francis explained, in words utterly different from those Mr. Bacon puts into his mouth, that the Duke only wished them to listen to the preachers.

Those who refused even to allow the Catholic proofs to be presented to them were exiled, several returning shortly afterwards at the intercession of the Saint, and finally entering the Church. The Duke's conduct is

related and well explained by M. Hamon. It was his personal action, dictated as much by political as by religious motives. We are not concerned to defend him, though we could easily do so. But now we admit that S. Francis himself renewed the proposals which, in 1596, he had asked to have carried out *après quelque temps*, meaning, no doubt, after the conversion of the country, which had now taken place. We have shown the course and state of things; we have shown that the Chablais had become Catholic with no "scattering terror," no use of the sword, no illegitimate influence of any kind. What we have to say refers not to the conversion of the country, but to its preservation in unity of religion. We do not think it necessary to defend the restitution of Church property, made now, and not before, to the original owners. The ministers were gone; those who did the work had a right to the fruits. We shall not either stay to defend the general application of Church law to this country, such as forbidding unorthodox books and teaching. We can reduce what we have to say to two points. S. Francis certainly asked that the ordinary civil law which made heretics ineligible for public functions might be carried out. As we have seen, the Calvinist magistrates and functionaries were mere instruments of foreign religious tyranny. There was no chance of *freedom* in the exercise of the Catholic religion so long as these agents of Berne remained in office. *Three years later*, also, he asked (*Let. Inéd.* 68), "that those who refused to profess the Catholic religion should leave the States of Savoy with leave to sell their goods;" but he gives his reason, showing that he does not put this pressure on them on account of their religion; "their affection is already perverted, and they follow their Huguenotism rather as a party than as a religion."

But we would put this matter on a broader ground than the mere justification of it in this particular case. We quite admit, as all Catholics must admit, that S. Francis de Sales acknowledged in the State a right and a duty to protect and to further God's revelation, to defend the people—especially the poor uneducated

people—from external attacks upon their faith or morality, nay, from their own proneness to error and vice. He would consider it lawful, in certain cases, to make the profession of heresy a note of disgrace, to punish it as other crimes are punished. To deny this is to assert that religion is only a matter of opinion or emotion, that God's revelation is uncertain, or unimportant. We speak in the abstract. We declare, with still greater earnestness, that he would make the *application* of these principles depend on circumstances, particularly on the state of religious opinion in the country, the existing law, the spirit of the age. Speaking generally of modern days, we say that justice and charity imperatively demand the toleration of religious differences. We consider that the circumstances of the case under consideration justified such action as S. Francis is responsible for.

With this we conclude our defence of the work of S. Francis in the actual conversion of the Chablais; but we have still to answer a bitter attack on a subject closely connected with it. Mr. Bacon makes S. Francis stimulator and accessory to an attempted escalade of Geneva, on the 12th of December, 1602. To begin with, such words suppose a crime, and the escalade was no more a crime than the taking of Paris out of the hands of the Commune. It is a question of history, of politics, and the rights of war. Geneva was the Duke's rebellious city. Taking advantage of his embroilments, it had invaded his other States with horrible ravages, and forced them into rebellion. He had never granted peace. The remarks of Francis, *six years before*, had reference to this state of things. As recently as the year 1600, Geneva had offered, when Henry IV. invaded Savoy, to seize again on the Chablais. The Duke did not recognize the new *status* of the city till 1604, when peace was made, and, after a desultory war of seventy years, thenceforward faithfully kept. The motive, again, which Mr. Bacon insinuates did not exist. Mr. Bacon asserts that, "to get possession of Geneva, and to be enthroned there, not only as bishop, but as secular prince, was one of Francis's earliest and

latest dreams." He is probably ignorant that the rights of the bishops, as temporal princes of Geneva, had been ceded to the Dukes of Savoy as early as 1518.¹ And, as to his spiritual rights, when told on his death-bed that he would live to be seated on the throne of Geneva, he said: "The throne of Geneva! I have never desired it, but only its conversion." (Hamon ii. 307.) But why do we delay on this? All we have to show, whether the escalade was justified or not, is that the Saint had nothing to do with it. Mr. Bacon says he was making his retreat before consecration in Annecy, when the baggage-train passed through it, and could not have been ignorant of its destination. He quotes a letter of S. Francis to his canons, in which he expresses a hope that he will soon see them in their "own city;" and he says S. Francis's confessor was the priest who heard the confessions of the escalading party. All this would be a poor proof at best, but we happen to have the exact dates, and to be able to overthrow the whole of it. In the first place, S. Francis was not in Annecy at all. He had chosen for his consecration day, from devotion to the Blessed Virgin, the feast of her Immaculate Conception (December 8th), which fell, in 1602, on the second Sunday of Advent, and he had gone to make a preparatory retreat *of twenty days* at Sales. He was consecrated in the family church at Thorens, and chose, again from devotion to our Lady, the following Saturday, *two days after* the attempted escalade, for his entry into Annecy. In the letter to the canons, S. Francis refers, not to Geneva, but to Annecy, which was at this time the "own city" both of bishop and canons. This is clear, from the very words written at Sales: "I salute you from here, hoping soon to see you in your own city, to which I desire the peace and consolation of the Holy Spirit." His confessor was Father Forrier (Forerius), who was directing his retreat at Sales. There was a Scotch Jesuit in the country about this time, named Forbes (Forbesius), who may have acted as chaplain to

¹ Maimbourg: "Hist. de Calvin," l. i. p. 37.

the soldiers. We suppose Mr. Bacon has confounded the two names. But what are we to think of the man who concludes such a miserable tissue of errors with the words : " We should wrong his blessed memory if we were to say that his guilt was demonstrated ? But many a wretch has been hanged with less evidence of complicity in less atrocious crime."

We trust to have now destroyed all ground of confidence in this writer, and here conclude our defence of the " distinguished sanctity," proceeding to fulfil the more pleasing, though not more important, duty of exhibiting the " eminent doctrine" of our great Doctor.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AND THE TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

BY E. LYTTLETON.

(*In two parts.*)

PART I.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), May, 1896.

AMONG the many arguments brought forward in controversy by the advocates of Women's Suffrage it cannot be said that a large proportion are drawn from the New Testament. Indeed, while some of the more eager partisans of the movement are content to disregard the teaching of the Apostles, the more cautious among their followers are avowedly haunted by an uneasy feeling of being ranged in direct opposition to the ideas contained in that teaching, and it can hardly be doubted that Scripture associations are still strong enough to keep at a distance many who, but for them, would have before now joined themselves willingly to a party of whose main object they thoroughly approve. And that which, perhaps, intensifies the reluctance openly to adopt opinions apparently contrary to the teaching of the New Testament writers is the knowledge that the most markedly conservative of

these writers, in his view of the position of women, is the large-minded, eminently progressive Apostle of the Gentiles, St. Paul.

We all know the first impressions gathered from St. Paul's Epistles as to the duties and position of women. We rise from reading, or hearing read, 1 Corinthians xi. and 1 Timothy ii. with a vague idea that he preached the doctrine of passive submission of women to men, as to a superior in the scale of creation; that he discouraged not only all public and political activity of women, but forbade them to teach, and, more than that, even to learn, except from their husbands at home.¹ Moreover, it seems as if he based his views not so much on any direct commands of his Master, as on a very literal acceptance of the account in the Book of Genesis of the fall of man.² Hence not only those who are anxious to see equality of women with men in respect of political privilege, but all who welcome the desire shown during the last half-century for the education of girls, and for the removal of depressing social restrictions in their daily life, are unable to resist a misgiving that, if St. Paul were alive now, he would be found among the most rigid opponents of these and such-like ideas; and, if they allow their thoughts to dwell a little longer on the subject, they feel obliged to resign themselves to what is apparently the true state of the case—viz., that the England of to-day is following in the steps of other more precipitate peoples, and gaily abandoning the Scriptural precepts which for many centuries have been her main guide in the conduct of life.

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss, as impartially as possible, how far the teaching of St. Paul is in conflict with the spirit of the Women's Suffrage movement of to-day, and how far those of us who have a profound reverence for the great Apostle feel bound to a literal obedience to his precepts in this most interesting, and in many respects most difficult subject.

Now the first observation necessary to make is that

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 35.

² 1 Tim. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xi. 8.

the Apostle's teaching about women cannot be made intelligible unless it is taken in connection with the Rabbinical teaching in which he was brought up, and with the social customs of the time. And not only does the teaching, when so viewed, become more intelligible, but a great deal more fruitful also. Few problems of greater interest could be presented for solution to a Jewish scholar than to determine how far St. Paul remained to the end of his life under the influence of Gamaliel, and how far his vigorous and divinely illuminated mind shook itself free from the intensely material and narrow prejudices in which the training of a young Pharisee must have been steeped. But it seems to me tolerably evident that, on the subject of the position and conduct of women, he was, till far on in his life, more under the dominion of Rabbinical prepossessions than on any other subjects of which he treats in his Epistles. But, before bringing facts in support of this statement, a word must be said as to the method of handling the precepts contained in Scripture which is here indicated.

Some years ago the majority of English Christians would have been unwilling to make use of the researches of Jewish or other scholars in the contemporary life of Palestine in such a way as to detract at all from the binding force of each particular injunction contained anywhere in the Bible. It was part of the current theory of inspiration, to which the Church has never committed herself, that every sentence, in the New Testament at least, was of equal value, and derived in an equal measure from heaven; and to some pious minds of the present day it is something of a shock to hear of any apostolic command having a basis in Rabbinical teaching, even though the fact cannot be denied. I have no wish to speak of this tone of mind with disrespect, or to imply, as many do, that because a different attitude is at present more fashionable, therefore the latter is sure to be right, and the former fit only to be regarded as a historical curiosity. But it is important to notice that, however strict and literal such a view of apostolic precepts may have been, it

has never been *consistently* made the basis of conduct.

Take, for instance, the words, "I suffer not a woman to teach."¹ Have "Bible Christians" of the most rigid school ever gone so far as to discountenance mothers from teaching their children the Lord's Prayer because of this text? If they have not, it is because they have recognised that St. Paul must either have been denouncing a practice imperfectly denoted by the word "teach," or else that any sort of teaching was so repugnant to the social practices of the time that he regarded such an innovation as a breach of decorum, and contrary to the ideas of women's function which prevailed among the most God-fearing communities. If the disregard of the precept is not based on some such view as this, then it is simply arbitrary and practised because it is convenient. But if, out of respect for St. Paul, we fall back on the statement that he was speaking with reference to his times, *or* was denouncing something different from what we call simply teaching, then it is not only not irreverent but positively incumbent on us to go a step further and inquire what those social customs were, or what was the practice which the Apostle had in his mind;² in other words, as we are all agreed that certain precepts are to be disregarded in practice, all that is now proposed is to try and

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 12.

² There is little doubt that the teaching referred to was something of a public nature (*cf.* Eph. iv. 11, where a teacher is spoken of as a public minister, and Rom. xii. 7). Such a proceeding would have been quite impossible among Jews (*cf.* Edersheim, "Sketches of Social Life," chap. ix. p. 132, and Didon's "Jesus Christ," p. 81, 2nd ed.), and quite foreign also to the customs of Greek communities. A conjecture may be hazarded that the women converts who put themselves forward in this way were drawn from the class known as *Hetairai*, *i.e.*, foreign women of every sort of character, good and bad, but free and unconventional in their conduct; often prominent in society and of brilliant accomplishments. If this class existed in St. Paul's time, some doubtless would have become converts. But the evidence is scanty (*cf.* Grote, "Hist. Gr.," pt. ii. c. 48; Lecky, "Hist. Eur. Morals," ch. v.; Mahaffy, "Social Life in Greece," 2nd ed., p. 278, c. ix. There are some interesting remarks in Prof. Ramsay's "The Church and the Roman Empire," as to the freedom of women in Asia Minor (*Vide reff.* p. 494, 3rd ed.).

find a principle on which we do so. Anything, surely, is better than to go on professing a literal adherence to all the New Testament injunctions while, at the same time, ignoring some of them without knowing why.

It may further be remarked that if modern research has succeeded in placing some of the apostolic teaching in its proper historical setting, with the result of investing certain precepts with more or less authority than others, it has also been the means of establishing on a firmer basis than ever the incomparable universality of all the teaching of our Lord. The more distinctly we perceive that a supreme genius like that of St. Paul was hampered in some respects by his early training and by the social customs of his age, the deeper becomes our wonder at the uniqueness of the spiritual and ethical precepts of Christ, their marvellous detachment from all that was merely national and transitory, the ease with which they employ Jewish and Palestinian illustration while setting forth principles of worldwide application and eternal import.¹ This remark, it is true, is not strictly relevant to our subject, but it is useful as a reminder that any apprehensions which may have been felt as to the effects of "criticism" on the authority of the Apostles should be balanced by the fuller certainty which we have gained of our Lord's unapproachable supremacy as a teacher.

In drawing attention to the Jewish parallels to St. Paul's words on the subject of the relation of the sexes, I must rely to a great extent on the late Dr. Ederheim's interesting and learned work, "*Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*," where the points of contact between St. Paul and the Rabbis are shown to be so frequent as to suggest the inference that a complete knowledge of their writings might enable us to explain nearly all the most obscure verses in the Epistles. We will begin with the most characteristic and startling of St. Paul's arguments. In 1 Tim.

¹ This point has often been emphasised, nowhere more finely than by Professor Goldwin Smith, quoted in Bishop Westcott's "*Historic Faith*" (Appendix).

ii. and 1 Cor. xi. the Apostle supports his statement of the relation of woman to man, and of both to God, by a reference to the account of Creation and of the Fall of Man in the Book of Genesis. It will be at once seen that his argument presupposes a very literal interpretation of the ancient record, but not more literal than many readers of the Bible would postulate nowadays, and certainly not so literal and, so to speak, external as that employed by the Rabbis.

Let us compare the two. In the two chapters above mentioned the Apostle seems to conceive of a gradation; of man being nearer to God than woman, and from this he infers the duty of *subordination* (ὑποτάγη) as belonging to married women, and that of ruling the household as being the prerogative of the husband. The reason he gives for his belief is the historical fact recorded in Genesis ii. that woman was created for the man, not *vice versa*, and that sin entered the world through a woman.¹

Now we should embarrass the subject with fresh perplexities were we to embark on the question of how far the prevailing modern view of the story in Genesis being the framework of a spiritual truth, would harmonise with this treatment of the Old Testament. In any case, the important question remains for those who take a literal as well as for those who take a more allegorical view of the narrative: Why does St. Paul adduce the story as an argument at all? Granting that sin entered the world through a woman, is that a legitimate reason for advocating for all women a permanent position of subordination to men? No modern writer would say that it was. But such a handling of the Old Testament would have seemed liberal compared with the following:

"The Rabbis argue that man must seek after a woman, and not a woman after a man; only the reason they assign for it sounds strange. Man, they say, was formed from the ground—woman from man's rib; hence, in trying to find a wife, man only looks for what he had lost! . . . Similarly it was observed that God had not formed woman out of the head, lest she should become proud; nor out of the eye,

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 8, 9; 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14.

lest she should lust ; nor out of the ear, lest she should be curious ; nor out of the mouth, lest she should be talkative ; nor out of the heart, lest she should be jealous ; nor out of the hand, lest she should be covetous ; nor out of the foot, lest she be a busybody ; but out of the rib, which was always covered. Modesty was therefore a prime quality."¹

It is pretty certain that this sort of teaching represents the general attitude of the Rabbis towards the Old Testament, and that St. Paul must have been brought up by men whose habit it was to base their rules of conduct and life on those strange verbal inferences from the Thorah. If this was so we may well be amazed, not at the deference the Apostle shows to such views, but at his superiority to them, and at his power of seizing on the kernel of the story when all his teachers (presumably) had been satisfied with the shell. Again, we can hardly understand the Apostle's injunction that wives shall learn of their husbands at home, unless we know something of the social regulations of the time. In the synagogues the women were rigorously separated from the men by a partition of boarding and gratings, the practice being justified by Zachariah xii. 11-14. Moreover, to make up for the deficiencies in their education,² women were admonished to encourage their husbands in the study of the law (p. 147). No doubt instances of well-instructed women, such as Eunice or Priscilla, did occur ; but, in general, it seems that girls were rather left to take their chance, while the teaching of the law to boys was a primary part of all education and one of the first duties of a father. The women seem to have attended the synagogues in silence,³ and to have been absolved from the obligation of saying certain prayers, Dr. Edersheim thinks, because of a wife being so far one with her husband that "his merits and prayers applied to her as well." Then, when we find St. Paul⁴ and St. Peter⁵ inculcating a general meekness and sobriety of life among women, we should remember that brawling and gossip in the streets on the part of a wife were suffi-

¹ Edersheim, p. 146.

² *Ibid.* p. 132.

³ Didon, p. 81.

⁴ 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

⁵ 1 Pet. iii. 1-6.

cient grounds for a divorce ; and the direction that women were not to usurp authority over men is paralleled by the Rabbinical saying, " Whoever allows himself to be ruled by his wife shall call out and no one will make answer to him."

THE THEOLOGY OF THE PSALMS.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. T. W. DAVISON, D.D.

From *The Expository Times* (Edinburgh), June, 1896.

(*In two parts.*)

PART I.

LIFE'S PROBLEMS.

SPIRITUAL fellowship with God, as a member of the chosen nation, formed the Psalmist's chief joy. But material considerations were by no means disregarded in his religion. For one thing, they could not be ; the conditions of life were sometimes hard in the extreme, far beyond the conceptions of arm-chair saints or philosophers of happier days. Further, the religion of Israel traditionally associated piety and prosperity. Obey, and it shall be well with thee ; disobey, and perish ; is the language of law and prophets alike. The prayers and praises of the Psalms would neither be honest on the one hand, nor in accordance with the characteristic genius of Hebrew religion on the other, if they were not concerned with the joys and sorrows, successes and failures, prosperity and adversity, of concrete individual and national life. And, as every reader knows, this is their main concern. Lofty spirituality is not lacking, but it does not form the main web and fibre of the Psalms. The singers of these sacred lyrics brought their common life into their religion, and their religion into their common life. They lived in the spirit of St. James' words written long

afterwards, 'Is any among you suffering? Let him pray. Is any cheerful? Let him sing praise.'

But no sooner is this done, than difficulties begin to arise. To move in the purely spiritual region is to fly in the air; to interweave religion with common life is to travel upon the earth, and to meet with obstacles and pitfalls innumerable. For the suffering to pray is easy; but suppose deliverance does not come? For the cheerful to sing praise is not difficult, but how if cheerfulness abounds chiefly among those who do not sing praise, but pour out blasphemies? These questions may not occur to the mind of the saint; or if they do, may be so speedily stifled that it is as if they had not been. Where, however, they have once openly been asked, they must be answered, or be declared unanswerable. And an answer is likely to take one or other of the following forms:—(1) God will speedily intervene in answer to prayer. (2) Delay may take place, in which case chastisement is wholesome for the sufferer. (3) A better state of things may be expected in some later epoch of national or earthly life. (4) The balance will be redressed in a future state. There remain the possible alternatives: (5) No redress is to be certainly looked for, no explanation can be given of the problems of life. Yet God is good; this is the refuge of the baffled saint. Or (6) there is no God that judgeth in the earth; which is the resort of the despairing and sceptical sinner.

The writers of the Psalms seldom touch upon these world-old problems. They are in trouble, and they cry to God for help; or they are happy, and they praise His name; they hopefully anticipate deliverance, or earnestly expostulate with God, or patiently submit to the counsel of His will; their hopes and fears alternate very rapidly, like the sunshine and shadow, the 'chequer-work of light and shade' upon the hillside on a summer's day; but they seldom doubt or question, and hardly ever deny. A few psalms, like the 73rd and 77th, describe in full the mood of questioning and a succeeding mood of relief and enlightenment, but there are not many psalms like these.

Fear and unbelief are common enough, but the kind of fear and unbelief in which the naturally religious mind questions the reality of the foundations of its own faith is foreign to the Psalter. The religion of the child has its storms and earthquakes, but there are some things in it which are never questioned, and the religion of the Psalms is like the religion of childhood in this respect. Not that it is shallow, but it is simple, often *naïf*, free alike from self-consciousness and self-questioning. It is to the Book of Job, and later, to the Book of Ecclesiastes, that we must turn for a mirror of latter-day doubt, scepticism, and despair. This is a fact which must be faced by those who draw down the whole Psalter to post-Exilic days, and the greater part of it to the late Persian and Greek periods. The simplicity of faith which marks the Psalms as a whole would surely have shown more signs of disturbance had the writers been brought face to face with problems which had become familiar long before the second century before Christ. It may be said that such doubts and religious anxieties would not find a place in lyric poetry, and especially in temple songs; but we find almost all moods reflected in the Psalms, and the comparative rarity of this one, which has given rise to some of the finest and profoundest poems in all literature, is at least noteworthy.

What may be called the ordinary moods of the psalmists require no comment. For the most part, as has been said, the writer of a psalm thanks God for mercies received, or he spreads his troubles before the Lord, simply and hopefully expecting deliverance. He may be too heavily bowed down by calamity to anticipate succour, though this is rare; but in such a case he moans out his sorrow into what he knows to be a sympathetic Ear, finds relief in the act, and goes his way. There is something touching and very significant in the variety of the airs played upon these few simple strings, but there is nothing which calls for explanation or comment. The righteous is sad, but God is good, He will help, the wicked shall perish, right will be done,—hope, trust, wait, pray! So do

these saints of old breathe out their souls Godwards, and sound in the ears of succeeding generations the trumpet-note of patience, courage, and fidelity unto death, which has animated so many fainting soldiers of righteousness in their long and arduous war. But the moods are too familiar to need illustration. The first psalm, in its didactic fashion, lays it down that in whatsoever the godly man doeth he shall prosper, but the way of the ungodly shall perish. Almost the last psalm declares that He will 'beautify the meek with victory,' whilst the saints, with the high praises of God in their mouths, shall execute upon the rebels against Him the judgment that is written. The psalmist of the earlier period is sure that when he cries unto God with his voice, God will hear him out of His holy hill. He never doubts that 'if a man turn not, God will whet His sword,' or that if a man makes a pit and digs it, he will fall into the ditch he himself has made. The psalmist of the later periods is equally certain that 'except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it,' and that 'blessed is every one that feareth the Lord,' it shall be well with him indeed. His wife shall be a fruitful vine, his children shall be strong, young olive plants, and round his table he shall see his children's children and the good of Jerusalem all the days of his life.

Nor is this to be explained away as the euphemism of poetry. The psalmists know what trouble is—none better. They do not glide gently over their calamities, or apply the deceitful balm of optimistic commonplace to their own or their neighbours' wounds. When they are hurt, they cry out: 'Jehovah, heal me; for my bones are vexed. My soul also is sore vexed, and Thou, Jehovah, how long? I am weary with my groaning, every night make I my bed to swim; I water my couch with my tears.' 'I am faint and sore bruised; I have roared by reason of the disquietude of my heart. Lord, all my desire is before Thee, my groaning is not hid from Thee.' But in the midst of all this sore complaint comes perhaps an acknowledgment that the trouble is deserved, it is the punishment

of sin. 'I will declare my iniquity, I will be sorry for my sin' (xxxviii. 18). Or an assurance that though the Psalmist is alone and helpless, and the very 'foundations' seem to be destroyed, yet 'Jehovah is in His holy temple; Jehovah, His throne is in heaven; His eyes behold, His eyelids try, the children of men.' All be well, the righteous Lord reigneth; 'upon the wicked He shall rain snares' (xi. 6), but 'the upright shall behold His face.' This confidence in a retribution to come, perhaps speedily, and certainly sooner or later upon the earth, is a keystone in the religion of the Psalms. It is, with a few exceptions, an unquestioned and unquestionable axiom, and there follow from it certain conclusions which are familiar to all readers of the Psalms. Trust in God, the hearer and answerer of prayer; patience on the part of the godly till God's own time for intervention has come; unsparing denunciation of all evil-doers, and sometimes stern imprecation of punishment upon them; an assurance that God is upon the Psalmist's side so confident and complete that the sufferer in trouble enjoys continually a more than anticipated personal and national triumph.

Sometimes the note of the victorious warrior prevails and his tone towards his enemies is that of ancient warfare,—defiance vigorous, whole-hearted, and implacable. Sometimes the note of the patient and resigned sufferer rules the strain, but the confidence of ultimate deliverance is no less complete. One psalmist may burst out abruptly: 'Why boastest thou thyself in mischief, thou tyrant, thou mischievous and deceitful tongue? God shall destroy thee for ever; He shall take thee up and pluck thee out of thy tent, and root thee out of the land of the living' (Ps. lii.). Another may gently, almost plaintively, remonstrate with his neighbour or his own soul, not to 'fret' over the prosperity of the man who brings wicked devices to pass, but to 'be still before the Lord,' and 'roll his way upon the Lord,' since the meek shall inherit the land, and fretfulness 'tendeth only to evil-doing.' The different tone may indicate different circumstances or a different temperament; the former may proceed

from a more virile and active spirit, the latter may indicate a feminine resignation which yet possesses a strength and tenacity all its own. Or it may be that evil of some kind raises in every breast a righteous indignation which makes strong words necessary, whereas hardship of circumstances and general lot or condition calls for mild and passive endurance. The point is, that the Psalmist's confidence in God as a righteous Judge, and in retribution ere long to appear upon the earth, is in either case unmoved and unmovable. It is the 'brutish man' that does not know, the 'fool' that does not understand this (Ps. xcii.). The wicked man in great power, 'spreading himself like a green tree in its native soil,' will soon pass away and be no more, and the whole course of history shall show triumphantly that 'my Rock is upright, and there is no unrighteousness in Him.'

WENDT'S UNTRANSLATED VOLUME ON
THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.

BY JAMES STALKER, D.D.

From *The Expositor* (London), June, 1896.

(In two parts.)

PART I.

"BACK to Christ" is the watchword of theology at the present time; and there can be little doubt that the question, what precisely was taught by Christ, will be the most burning theological topic of the first decade of the twentieth century.

It seems an easy thing to discover what Christ taught, for in the four Gospels all His words are contained within a very narrow compass. In other writings stray utterances of His may be discovered, but they are exceedingly rare, and do not in the least modify the general impression of His teaching. The question, however, has been raised: Are we sure that

all the words attributed to our Lord in the Gospels are really His ; or, as we read, do we require to exercise caution and criticism ?

Wendt's well-known book is at present our most detailed and handy account of the teaching of Jesus. But, in true German fashion, Wendt began with a thorough investigation of the record of our Lord's teaching in the Gospels, proceeding on the maxim that you cannot be sure what ideas are to be attributed to any one till you have ascertained the amount of credit due to the documents in which they are contained. This preliminary volume has not been translated—the publishers apparently believing, perhaps with wisdom, that it would not be acceptable to the British public. But it is a book of three hundred and fifty closely printed pages, and a sketch of its contents will show, perhaps more clearly than anything else, where advanced scholarship stands at present in relation to this question.

Wendt begins with a description of what he obviously believes to have been the course of the life of Jesus. He says it forms the framework of St. Mark, the oldest of our Gospels.

It is as follows : Jesus at first was neither recognised by others as the Messiah nor expressly known to be such by Himself. He deliberately held back the public proclamation of His Messianic title, and only at a comparatively late period of His career received from His disciples an acknowledgment of His dignity. Not till the very end was at hand did He permit the open acknowledgment of the fact or come forward with a claim to it Himself. St. Mark gives no hint that the Baptist knew or pointed out Jesus as the Messiah. According to his account, John indeed made known that the Messiah was about to appear, but not that Jesus was the Messiah ; and at the baptism the vision of the dove was seen by Jesus alone, as He alone heard the voice by which He was designated the Son of God. St. Mark then describes how, on commencing His public work, Jesus was recognised as the Son of God—that is, the Messiah—only by the demoniacs, whom,

however, He sternly forbade to make Him known. The rest of the people, on the contrary, when they beheld His extraordinary works, at first inquired in bewilderment what was the significance of His activity and His person ; and then, when they had had time to think, formed and uttered their opinions about Him—these, however, being such as involved a complete denial of His Messianic dignity or, while acknowledging that He was sent of God, yet withheld the full acknowledgment. St. Mark gives prominence to the scene in which, in contrast with this behaviour of the multitude, the apostles, through the mouth of St. Peter, gave expression to their conviction that he was the Messiah ; and he sets in the fullest light his sense of the importance of this epoch-making incident by making Jesus, from this point onwards, introduce a new element into His teaching—the prediction, namely, of His own sufferings and the sufferings of those who confessed Him. Meantime, however, He sternly forbade the Twelve to make known the conclusion at which they had arrived ; and, in accordance with this, the first outside the circle of the Twelve who publicly named Jesus the Son of David—the blind beggar, Bartimæus, at Jericho—was commanded by the apostles to hold his peace. At this point, however, Jesus withdrew the seal of silence and immediately thereafter accepted the Messianic homage of the pilgrims, as He entered Jerusalem. This decided His fate with the hierarchy ; and at last, in presence of the high priest, Jesus solemnly claimed the Messianic dignity. St. Mark closes his account of the life of Christ with the story of how the heathen centurion, seeing His behaviour on the cross, exclaimed, " Truly this was the Son of God."

This, according to St. Mark—and Wendt enthusiastically adopts it—was the outline of Christ's life ; but, strange to say, the evangelist does not adhere to it himself. It is only by piecing certain parts together from his Gospel that you ascertain that this was the real course of events. These pieces, we can yet see, were originally joined ; for the ending of one runs into

the opening of the next, when what comes between in the actual St. Mark is removed. The evangelist has allowed the historical outline to be crossed and blurred by a series of accounts of conflicts between Jesus and the hierarchy. This section also is cut up into fragments, which are scattered over the Gospel; but in the same way we can see, from the endings and beginnings of the different parts, that they originally formed a single whole. There is a third series, treated in the same way, which consists of passages setting forth the necessity and the value of suffering. And there are two other smaller series, which need not be further particularised.

Wendt does not hold that these different series of passages were different documents, which St. Mark incorporated in his narrative: the stamp of the same authorship is too unmistakably on them all for this. He falls back on the old statement of Papias: that St. Mark derived his information from St. Peter: and he believes that these series represent different discourses of St. Peter, or different groups of reminiscences which the apostle was in the habit of delivering together in St. Mark's hearing. Thus there was one discourse in which St. Peter used to give the historical framework of Christ's life; then there was another in which he used to give a collection of anecdotes illustrative of the witty and pithy replies wherewith Jesus confounded opponents; and there was a series of sayings, enclosed within an outline of incident, in which were predicted the sufferings certain to follow the confession of Christ; and so on. St. Mark had these separately in his mind, but he had to combine them into a book; and, not being a man of letters, he did it clumsily; and criticism has to take the patchwork asunder and restore the pieces to the places which they occupied as they came from the lips of St. Peter.

Observe this, however: these Petrine reminiscences do not make up the whole of St. Mark's Gospel. The evangelist incorporated other materials, derived from sources to us unknown but scarcely likely to be of the same dignity. And it is noteworthy that among the

additions Wendt reckons some of the greatest miracles of our Lord—such as the Stilling of the Storm and the Feeding of the Five Thousand.

Wendt's treatment of the Gospel of St. John is of a startling character, but it is carried through with great boldness and ability. He discerns in this Gospel two totally distinct hands, not to speak of a third, to which the last chapter is due.

One of the writers is St. John himself. Wendt believes that the apostle was persuaded in his old age to collect his reminiscences, and these form the substance of the present Gospel. They consisted chiefly of sayings and discourses, perhaps bound together by a few slight threads of narrative; but no attempt was made by the apostle to give a connected life of Christ. This attempt was, however, made and carried through by a disciple of St. John, who incorporated the reminiscences of his master with his own ideas and fitted the whole within a historical framework.

In proof that the bulk of the Fourth Gospel is due to St. John, Wendt adduces the words of the Prologue—which, by the way, is not the work of the editor, but the apostle—"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth." Further, the language throughout is that of a Hebrew, who had been brought up on the Septuagint. Especially by the sovereign way in which he makes Jesus handle the Old Testament the writer shows that he must have been in the closest touch with the Lord. It is true, there is a wide discrepancy between the language in which he makes his Master speak and that in which Jesus is made to speak in the Synoptists; but this is sufficiently accounted for by the powerfully developed spiritual individuality of the apostle; and the difference is confined to the form of Christ's words: it does not extend to the substance, which is identical with that found in the Synoptists. Of this Wendt has given detailed proof in the second—that is, the translated—part of his work. So, John has a peculiar vocabulary; but its leading catchwords are simply

equivalents for the leading catchwords of the Synoptists; and the circle of Christ's teaching in St. John, when laid above the circle found in the Synoptists, corresponds with it point by point, although, of course, at some points St. John is more expansive and goes deeper.

Wendt's account of the other writer whose hand is discernible in the Fourth Gospel is a severe one. He expressly exonerates him, indeed, from deliberate falsification; but short of this there is nothing of which the bungler is not capable.

He has entirely obliterated the historicity of the career of Jesus, as criticism is able to exhibit it by judicious excerpts from St. Mark. This career began in obscurity; for a long time Christ performed His acts of healing in secret and suppressed every allusion to His Messiahship; the confession of the Twelve that He was the Messiah was the great crisis; thereafter only did Jesus venture to speak of His sufferings and death; and only towards or at the very end did He permit the Messianic dignity to be ascribed to Him or claim it Himself. The author, however, of the Fourth Gospel in its present form introduces allusions to Christ's sufferings and death from the very first, and takes every opportunity of asseverating that Jesus knew from the beginning that He was to be betrayed by one of the Twelve. In like manner he makes the Baptist recognise Jesus as the Messiah, clean against the representation of St. Mark; and as early as the fourth chapter he makes Jesus Himself say in so many words, "I am the Messiah," to a Samaritan woman. Many, indeed, are represented as denying that He is the Messiah; but allusions to the fact that this is His destiny are numerous from the very commencement of His career.

Even this total oblivion of the true course of the history of Jesus is, however, not the worst. This editor's very conception of Christianity is widely different from that of Christ, which is faithfully reproduced in his own peculiar dialect by St. John. The latter is deep, inward, mystical; the editor's is external and mechani-

cal. For example, in the portions of the Gospel due to the apostle "eternal life" is a present possession of every one who believeth on the Son of God; but to the editor it is a possession which is to begin in the next world. And, in the same way, "judgment" is in St. John's mouth or Christ's a process which is proceeding now—every one who comes into contact with Christ is *ipso facto* judged—but to the editor judgment is a public scene, which will take place at the end of time. The same habit of mind is displayed in the way in which the editor relies on external proofs of the divine origin of Christianity. Jesus Himself rebuked the desire of the Jews for signs and refused to give them; but to the editor the miracles are the commanding evidence, and he has a kind of craze for emphasizing the importance of the testimony of the Baptist.

Unfortunately the editor has mixed up his own additions with the material derived from the apostle so closely that it is no easy task to separate the gold from the alloy. He has even intruded into the Prologue, interrupting its glorious march with two or three irrelevant remarks on his favourite topic of the testimony of John. But Wendt is not discouraged. He goes resolutely through chapter after chapter, and excises now a long paragraph, then a verse or two, here a line and there a word; and he seldom has any hesitation. In the first chapter, for example, he cuts away the whole passage in which the Baptist bears testimony to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, together with the passages thereon ensuing in which St. John and others have their first interview with Jesus amid circumstances which have been supposed to bear marks, tender and unmistakable, of personal recollection. A curious specimen of the results of Wendt's method is found in the eleventh chapter—the account of the raising of Lazarus. Something proceeding from St. John is here the substratum, but verse by verse it has to be disentangled from the editor's additions. Lazarus had died, and Jesus came a long distance to console the sisters. He naturally talked with them of the certainty that their brother would

rise again in the resurrection at the last day ; and out of these remarks a story gradually span itself of a resurrection effected by Jesus on the spot ; but no such thing really took place.

Wendt is by no means unaware of the reluctance which will be felt by all who are acquainted with the spell of St. John, which appears to pervade every page of the Gospel and lends it a character so unique, to accept the theory of a twofold authorship ; but he maintains that only on these terms is it possible to retain the apostolicity of the Gospel as a whole ; for the historical framework is such as could have been constructed by no one acquainted at first hand with the course of Christ's career.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH, ITS SPIRITUAL STATE AND POSSIBILITIES.

BY ISABEL F. HAPGOOD.

From *The Outlook* (New York), June 20, 1896.

(*In two parts.*)

PART I.

WHAT elements of true life does the Russian Church possess? What are its capacities for development? These are important questions, especially in connection with the widespread and growing interest in the subject of Church Unity. We must first examine a few of the factors in the case. Then the questions will almost answer themselves.

Both the Church of Rome and the Church of England have made repeated overtures to the Russian Church—or to the Greek Church, of which the Russian is now the most important and prominent branch—with a view to union. On one or two occasions in the past, Rome has come very near indeed to attaining her object. But what the political wisdom of the highest ecclesiastical authorities reluctantly accepted at

severe crises in the history of the Eastern Church, the hearts and consciences of that Church, as a body, rejected. At the present day, when the political and ecclesiastical prospects of the Latin and the Greek Catholic Churches have, practically, exchanged places, it is not probable that such overtures will result in anything more serious than a welcome excuse for a pleasant official sojourn in Rome on the part of some lucky Russian secular envoy. It is not likely that the Latin Church will be able to repeat the half-victory won three hundred years ago among the Orthodox population of Roman Catholic Poland, and the Slavonic peoples of eastern Austria and Hungary. There she persuaded the people (hence called "Uniate") to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, and to accept the *Filioque* clause in the Creed, on condition that they were allowed to retain their own liturgy in the vernacular tongue, the Holy Communion in both kinds for the laity, the married parish clergy, and a few minor rights.

In England a society has existed for years for the promotion of union between the Anglican and the Russian Churches. It counts among its members a goodly array of Bishops and, so late as 1888, at the celebration of the 900th anniversary of the baptism of the Russians, the English Church expressed its hopes, through the Archbishop of Canterbury. But it has not, so far as I am aware, yet complied with the suggestion made in his friendly reply by Plato, the venerable Metropolitan of Kieff, that it would formulate a definite proposal of terms of a reunion. But last summer the Russian Bishop for America (Nikolai, Bishop of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands) was most cordially received at St. Paul's in London; and Bishop Wilkinson, on his triennial visit to Russia last March, was welcomed by the Russian ecclesiastics with unprecedented warmth and friendliness, while hopes of union were expressed with equal earnestness and frankness on both sides. Meanwhile, the Russian Church prays daily "for the prosperity of all God's holy churches, and the union of all," and waits, with calm, patient dignity, for the other

churches to unite with her, the original, historic Mother Church, which she firmly believes that they all will do, some day.

Now, no one deliberately invites a lifeless corpse to become a member of a living, growing body of men. Therefore, we may consider that the elementary question as to whether the Greco-Russian Catholic Church really consists, exclusively, as is often asserted (chiefly on hearsay evidence), of a mass of dead ceremonies participated in by souls to match, has been definitely and satisfactorily answered for us by the Anglican and Latin Catholic Churches.

I find that the majority of people are in the habit of regarding the Russian Church—"the Russian religion" they call it—as a thing utterly apart from and unconnected with us; in the light of something far removed from the comprehension and sympathies of all Western nations. A little knowledge in regard to the "Orthodox Church" would afford at once half an answer to the questions which I stated at the beginning of my article. As a matter of fact, the Orthodox Russian Church is very near akin indeed to both the Latin Catholic and the Protestant Churches. It forms a sort of connecting link between them. If they have shown capacity for development as churches; if they have demonstrated their power to evolve strong, fine, spiritual characters, why should that capacity and power be denied to a Church which combines some of the strong points of both? I do not think that there is the slightest likelihood that any union between these three great sections of Christianity will be brought about for a very long time to come—if ever. The barriers are slight but unsurmountable, human nature being what it is, and divine revelation being open to divers interpretations, in this world at least. Moreover, the religion of any nation or of any individual is, in large measure, a question of birth, geography, politics, and social conditions—and, last, but far from least, of temperament. But so long as any one purely Christian Church devotes itself conscientiously to its proper province, the spiritual, and does not turn itself into a political machine,

there is no valid reason why the members of every other Christian Church should not encourage, sympathize with, and love it, in proportion to individual knowledge, zeal, and temperament.

If the Russian Church would but admit to communion the members of the Anglican Church, I am sure that there are plenty who would willingly comply with her requirements as to fasting and confession, for the sake of attaining such an end, though it would be better, of course, if no conditions were imposed on either side. It is not probable that there would be, in any case, on the Anglican side.

But the relations of the three great divisions of the Catholic Church which I have mentioned can easily be stated without going very deeply into either historical, political, or geographical questions.

The creed known as the Nicene Creed still remains in full force in both branches of the Christian Church, with but one slight difference. That difference occurs in the statement regarding belief in the Holy Ghost. As finally settled by the Council of Constantinople in 381, and as still used by the Eastern Church, the clause in question reads: "And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father; Who, with the Father and the Son, is worshipped and glorified." A little more than two hundred years later, the Western Church, influenced chiefly by the logic of St. Augustine, decided that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. Therefore, as a protection against the Arian doctrines, which were rife in Spain, the Council of Toledo, in the year 589, added what is known as "the Filioque clause" to the Symbol or Creed of Constantinople. Hence our Western creed differs from the Eastern creed by exactly these words: "The Holy Ghost, . . . which proceedeth from the Father and the Son." The reasons for this difference in the Creed are good on both sides. The Western Church argues that the change was necessary, in order that the identity of the Holy Spirit with Christ and with God the Father might be asserted in a clear and indisputable manner; that the

abstract unity of the Godhead might be guarded from all doubt or dispute. The Eastern Church, on the other hand, holds to the view that to make the Holy Spirit proceed equally from the Father and the Son is to imply two active principles or creative powers in the Divine Essence, and this divides the Godhead into two gods, and confounds the persons of the Trinity, besides being directly contrary to Scripture, and Christ's words in John xv., 26. It is easy to see how these diametrically opposed contentions have furnished and will continue to furnish, on demand, food for endless theological discussion, though learned divines of the Anglican Church have admitted that the addition was made arbitrarily and unnecessarily, to say the least. Neither side will yield—certainly the Eastern Church will not—and, really, it is not necessary that they should. At bottom both branches believe in the same essential dogmas: the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the identity of the Holy Spirit in essence, with God the Father and the Son. Discussion keeps alive interest; but the Russian Church holds that Roman Catholicism is the chief heresy of these latter days, and that the Pope of Rome is the first heretic.

A brief statement of the likenesses and differences will help us to judge of the possibilities of the Russian Church by our estimate of our own. The Greek and Latin Catholic Churches agree as to the number of sacraments—seven—and as to their nature, with the exception of Extreme Unction, which the Greek Church administers, in the apostolic spirit, as a means of bodily and spiritual healing, not as a final sacrament when death is inevitable, and which is designated by a word that signifies an assembling together, seven ecclesiastics being assembled, if possible, to pray and anoint the sufferer. They agree as to Transubstantiation, though not as to the moment or manner in which the solemn change in the holy elements is effected; they pray for the dead, and recognize the intercession of the saints and of the Virgin Mary. But, while the Latin Church denies the cup to laymen in the Holy Communion, requires celibacy in all ecclesiastics, forbids infant con-

firmation and communion, and asserts the Infallibility of the Pope and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, the Greek Church admits and forbids precisely the opposite things, insisting, in particular, that all parish priests shall be married before they are ordained, relegating celibacy to the higher orders of the priesthood, and absolutely rejecting the Pope as head of the Church, his infallibility, and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. At this point it is proper to state, in the most emphatic manner, that the Emperor is not the head of the Russian Church in any other sense than Queen Victoria is the head of the English Church; that is to say, in so far as it is one of the State institutions. Queen Victoria is, in fact, more truly the head of the English Church than the Emperor is of the Russian, because she is so legally. That false statement has been repeated, ignorantly or willfully, until it has come to be almost an article of faith among foreigners. The truth is that when a Roman Catholic joins the Russian Church, one of the chief things asked of him is: "Dost thou renounce the erroneous belief that our Lord Jesus Christ must not be acknowledged as the head of the Universal Church, and that the head of Christ's body, that is to say, of the Church Universal, can be a man, to wit, the Bishop of Rome?" Answer: "I renounce it." I quote from the official "Office for the Reception into the Orthodox Church of Converts from Christian Churches." In connection with this rite, I may pause to correct another misconception, and to show, incidentally, that the Russian Church is more tolerant and Christian in its dealings with converts than several Protestant and other sects. It will be remembered that when the present Empress joined the Russian Church, before her marriage, the foreign press repeatedly asserted that she had been compelled to "curse" the religion (or faith) which she was leaving, and that she had to be baptized anew. On the contrary, the Russian Church recognizes *all* Christian baptism, whether by immersion or sprinkling; applies sprinkling herself, when circumstances require it, to her own infant members, and merely anoints con-

verts. The Holy Synod itself—not to mention the Emperor, who is a civil power—cannot change a single letter of the ecclesiastical law on such matters. And, indeed, it is inconceivable that, after recognizing the validity of baptism, the Russian Church should stultify herself by requiring converts to “curse” (or “anathematize”) the powers which administer that valid sacrament. Common sense should have refuted that gross libel long ago. The Empress was simply anointed with the holy chrism, after “confessing” the Orthodox faith and dogmas.

THE SUNDAY BICYCLE.

From *The Independent* (New York), June 4, 1896.

AMONG our minor religious problems we have none on hand of more serious and pressing present importance than the Sunday bicycle. It is already dangerous, and is growing more dangerous every day. The bicycle is no longer a fad or a fashion. Civilization has adopted it as one of its instruments.

It is not only for recreation or sport, but for all uses of locomotion. It is the most democratic of inventions, and will serve the artisan, the laborer, and all sorts and conditions of men. From the very first it was created superior to distinctions of sex.

It runs all the week, night or day, and comes up fresh and hearty ready to run on all day Sunday. And that is the trouble. To judge from appearances it has a special genius for locomotion on that day, as if it were created under some exemption from the law of rest. And mankind and womankind have adopted it so generally as a sort of extension of human nature's locomotive apparatus, that it is already absolutely a thing not to be spoken against. But how about Sunday? And how about church and church work?

Now these are questions that are staring us in the face and have to be answered. The Sunday streets are full of merry wheelers rolling by. They come in

groups flitting by from early dawn. The crowd thickens as the church hour draws near. All through the service their bells ring on the roadway. And so it goes on till the sun is down, when suddenly lamps are lighted and the Sabbathless parade is on again.

Now here is a danger which the churches have not had to meet before, and which is assailing them with a new and peculiarly seductive temptation. It seems all so pure and wholesome, so refreshing, so natural and so rich in rational delight, that excuses come easy as sinning. The Church and its duties stand no chance against the Sunday wheeling siren of the earthly paradise.

The full effect of all this on religion, on the churches, and on the religious work which must be done on Sunday, if done at all, is not yet felt. But it is extending and will be felt more and more. Any one who will scan closely the troops as they roll by will find many among them who by the habits, traditions, principles, professions, and serious convictions of their previous lives have little business to be there. They are there now only because after some struggle with themselves, they have lost something of the victory over self which alone can make the always triumphing Christian safe in his contest with the world.

We are not the first to raise the question. It has become a practical and painful problem in many a Christian home. Earnest Christian men and women, who have held their households together at church and in the mission offices and teaching work of active Christianity, have found themselves powerless and baffled in the presence of this new seduction. The question has been broached in the denominational assemblies. It will grow more urgent there. The pulpit will have to speak, and Christian people will have to take their stand and free their consciences on the subject. The Church has maintained the Lord's Day against attacks as dangerous and as insidious as this, and we do not doubt will do it now.

Exactly what position to take and how to solve the problem in all its relations may not be altogether clear.

It is a question which calls for discriminating treatment rather than wholesale condemnation. All cases cannot be provided for under one rule ; and when all is done and said it is not unlikely that we shall have to submit, with such charity as we can command, to considerable differences of opinion and of practice.

It is hard, however, to see how there can be any such differences as to the practice of Sunday meets and all wheeling parties for pleasure. Granted that the wheelman must be treated simply as a more expeditious pedestrian moving on his own locomotive apparatus, and that wherever and whenever it is right to walk it is right to wheel, still he remains a Christian and is under all the restraints and obligations which would apply to him as such. So obvious is this that many of the associations have adopted stringent rules against Sunday meets. While they have left their members free to ride or not as individuals, they have done what they could to keep clear of Sunday meets and pleasure parties.

The relation of this practice to the Church and Christian work on Sunday in the church, school or elsewhere, would perhaps strike most persons as the most dangerous of all. To us it seems the simplest thing in the world. What new principle of any kind is involved in it ?

The Church and its services on the Lord's Day are precisely what they always have been. The Christian duty of maintaining the religious character of the day remains the same. It always has cost something in the way of sacrifice to maintain a Christian Sunday, and it always will cost something in the way of sacrifice to do it. The day is worth to the Church, to the world, and to those who are faithful to it all the sacrifice that it costs.

When the believer has made these sacrifices and done what he can to keep the day on this ground, the bicycle problem will for him fade out of view.

CURRENT THOUGHT.

Christian Unity.

WE trust it is not an unconscious revelation of conceit on our part when we presume to say that we have never been at all confused by the confusing essays and speeches, the name whereof is legion, touching Christian union. We have found no one, however emphatic in his plea for union, giving the slightest intimation of a willingness to abandon his own sect or creed. Unitarians plead for union with Universalists, but they rarely unite themselves with Universalists; and Universalists plead for union with Unitarians, but they rarely unite with Unitarians. When the whole matter is reduced to its essentials, it never means more than a unity of spirit, and, in certain regards, co-operation on different lines for the same end. We are led to this reflection from having read the very lucid and impressive sermon by the Rev. Dr. R. R. Booth preached before the Presbyterian Assembly at Saratoga. Christian union was his theme, and in approaching it he gave several particulars as to what Christian union is not. It "does not lie in uniformity of structure or of government, and no strictness of such uniformity ever can secure it;" it cannot be reached by "any compress of uniformity;" it does not require "a renunciation and suppression of sincere convictions;" nor is it an "all-comprehending structure," the impulse for which is misleading; nor "even on a smaller scale will efforts to force together organizations that differ only in non-essential features have any actual results of union." Then what is Christian union? It is the uni-

ty of the spirit in the bonds of peace—simply this and nothing more; and this is a great deal.—*The Christian Leader, Boston (Univ.).*

At the recent Presbyterian General Assembly at Saratoga, the Committee on Church Unity was first relieved from further correspondence with other Presbyterian bodies, and then discharged from further conference with the commission of the Episcopal Church. This latter action was accompanied with a hope that correspondence might be renewed when the Episcopal Church was prepared to begin by taking the ground of reciprocity and mutual recognition. The ultimatum of the principal Presbyterian Church then comes to this, that the Church must first acknowledge that there is nothing in Episcopal orders which distinguishes them in point of validity from other Christian ministries. What is demanded is free "exchange of pulpits." At the bottom this means that the church shall cease to be "Episcopal" in any other sense than that in which the Methodists are "Episcopal." In fact, it involves even more than that. But setting aside the self-annihilation required of the Church, let us ask, what is the probability that even such a sacrifice would constitute a step toward any kind of organic union? All the so-called evangelical churches have pursued this plan of reciprocity and mutual recognition for many years, yet we fail to see that it had advanced the cause of real unity one iota. The only result plainly perceptible has been to add force to the popular depreciation of creeds. There are twelve

kinds of Presbyterians.—*The Living Church, Chicago* (P. E.).

FROM the beginning disciples of Jesus Christ have differed in their views concerning the teaching of their Lord and the best method of doing His work. Even such eminent and righteous men as Paul and Peter could not see eye to eye, and their lineal descendants have been found in every age of the Church. These differences of opinion are inevitable. They arise both from inherent personal idiosyncrasies and acquired beliefs. Some men are born Calvinists and others are born Arminians. Their mental and moral characteristics are as natural and unmistakable as is the color of their hair. No amount of training can do more than modify the natural characteristics of such men. Others of less decided personality are shaped almost entirely by environment. If they are taught that immersion is the only Scriptural baptism, they are immersionists. If their instructors favor affusion, they become affusionists. However it comes to pass, whether from in-born tendency or outward influences, diversity of belief reigns in the Christian world, manifesting itself in the existence of sects and in religious controversy. No small amount of good has resulted from these differences of opinion, in that men have been driven to arduous study and patient searching of the Word of God in order that they might buttress their respective positions.—*The Standard, Chicago* (Bapt.).

WHILE evangelical bodies are considering the question of church union, it is a subject which liberal Christians need to consider earnestly. The difficulty in forming an organic union among the liberals is that there is a liberal

party in nearly every large denomination, that they are separated from each other by traditional lines of policy, ritual, organization, and history, and that they are courageously and loyally seeking to lead forward the special denominations to which they belong. It would be unfortunate if the liberal element in each denomination formed itself into a new clan. It could but be expected that these different clans, inheriting tradition so different in the matter of worship and government, would find a basis of agreement simply upon doctrinal affinities. When liberal Christians leave the evangelical bodies, whether as ministers or laymen, they more naturally find affinity with some of the liberal bodies already organized, such as Universalists or Unitarians, unless they undertake the doubtful experiment of the independent church. The Liberal Congress may succeed in forming some of these independent asteroids into another denominational constellation. Yet independency has a centrifugal force which it has been sometimes very difficult to counteract by centripetal attraction, and the experiment of the Congress has not thus far been very successful.—*The Christian Register, Boston*. (Unit.).

The Presbyterian Assembly.

WE should like to discuss at length the doings of the Presbyterian General Assembly, but it is enough to say that the meeting at Saratoga indicates the inevitable turning of the tide. It is hard work for Christian men to keep up the tension of suspicious watchfulness against the heresy of their brethren more than five or six years at a time; after that they want peace. The Church was utterly tired of belligerent

orthodoxy, and was ready to experiment a while with placable orthodoxy. So the committee which has for these years been hetchelling the theological seminaries was discharged with thanks, and can do no more mischief. The seminaries which refused to submit to its recommendations were again "recommended," but not ordered—for they could not be ordered—to do something or other which they will not. A committee that was getting ready to lead the young people's societies out of the Christian Endeavor pastures into a tight Presbyterian paddock was thanked and bidden to go into better business. Some stout words were said to the New York Presbytery, which *will* take Union Seminary students under its care, but nothing more than words, until the relative rights of Presbytery and Assembly shall have been formulated. The Cincinnati Samson, who was about to pull down the Presbyterian House in New York, was told to go slow until a wise committee of ten laymen should consider the matter; and a committee was appointed to advise with the Board of Home Missions, whose expenses have got quite too far ahead of its income. It was a good, wise, conservative Assembly, which recognized that its predecessors had stirred up strife; and ex-Moderator Booth and Moderator Withrow were the leaders of a willing majority, who were glad at last to hear soft words.—*The Independent*, N. Y. (Undenom.).

In reviewing the reports of the recent General Assembly, and recalling those of the last few years, we share the general satisfaction which is felt that the time and energy which have been spent in contentions that all regret are henceforth to be laid out for more

rewarding results. Among the better things that have long been waiting for attention are the social problems of what we have learned to call "applied Christianity." These, with the exception of the temperance question and the Sabbath question, we think, have never been recognized, except perhaps allusively, in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. Other denominations, notably the Congregationalists and the Episcopalians, each of them much smaller bodies, have set a good example in this respect. No faithful church of Christ can permit it to be said that it is less concerned with questions of social morality than with those of theology and ritual. In the Civil War patriotism and religion had a common altar in the house of God. None the less so should it be now, when no longer an external foe, but an enemy within the gates, must be met. What more urgent duty now than to resist the spread of the venal spirit of self-seeking greed, both among the people and the elected servants of the people, by inculcating earnestly and constantly the principles of Christian citizenship—that the ballot and the public office are each a sacred trust for the common welfare?—*The Outlook*, N. Y. (Undenom.).

Higher Criticism.

SUPPOSE it were true that the results of the higher criticism represented only a passing phase of thought, and that all the conclusions which have given such offence are to be corrected by a new generation of scholars working gradually back to the old position. Are we, in the mean time, to assure a whole generation of young men that God is impotent for their salvation and direction if in the Bible "there is any mis-

take . . . of any sort whatever, either upon natural or physical science, or upon history or anything whatever?" That would be to make infidels by wholesale in our colleges and to put the study of the Bible into the hands of unbelieving scholars. We dare not so limit the Holy Spirit in our thought or creed. Good angels must laugh and grieve at such lack of faith in God's care for His own work. Truth is mighty and will prevail, and He who inspired the prophets can still apply the prophecies to man's need. The citadel of faith is not here, it is in the personal relation to Christ through the indwelling of the living Spirit. He is most concerned in the perfection or imperfection of the Bible, and may be trusted to vindicate the wisdom of his ways with man in his own fashion. And to say that he who has used imperfect men as his instruments from the beginning cannot use the Book unless it is wholly free from error is to reduce the whole argument to an absurdity.—*The Congregationalist, Boston.*

Divorce.

It appears strange that in the canons of the Church there is at present no enactment forbidding divorce for other than the one cause. So long as the separation of married parties is of such common occurrence, the haziness and indistinctness of church legisla-

tion on this important, even vital, social question is doubly deplorable. There is, indeed, a canon limiting the marriage of divorced people, and stating the condition under which a divorced person may be married again by a church clergyman. There must, however, be many cases in which divorced persons do not desire to marry again. Instances will occur to the minds of all in which those who have been divorced by the law of some State still remain, both man and woman, unmarried to any one else, and not reunited or reconciled in any way to each other. It is very necessary that the canons should state explicitly that only one cause can warrant a divorce, and how the parties to any divorce accomplished on any but scriptural warrant are to be dealt with by clergymen to whose congregation they belong. We are quite convinced that the generality of church people do not clearly know the Church's attitude on this subject. This leads to a confused and sometimes unworthy view of the serious obligations of the marriage contract. If the Church were in her canons to forbid divorce, excepting on the scriptural grounds, and were to append a penalty of some disciplinary kind to an unscriptural and therefore irreligious rupture of the marriage tie, we feel sure she would follow her Master's teaching.—*The Churchman, N. Y.* (P. E.).

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES R. GILLETT, LIBRARIAN OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE LITERARY STUDY OF THE BIBLE. An Account of the Leading Forms of Literature Represented in the Sacred Writings. Intended for English Readers. By RICHARD G. MOULTON, M.A. (Cambridge), Ph.D. (Pennsylvania), Professor of Literature of English in the University of Chicago. Boston: Heath, 1895, pp. xii., 533, 8vo, \$2.50.

This book might be described as "a protest against mediæval methods of printing the Bible," or as "a plea for a common-sense edition of the Bible." The necessity for such a work may be given in the words of the author: "The vast majority of those who read the Bible have never shaken off the mediæval tendency to look upon it as a collection of isolated sentences, isolated texts, isolated verses. Their intention is nothing but reverent; but the effect of their imperfect reading is to degrade a sacred literature into a pious scrap-book." Professor Moulton sees that the Bible has long been and still is misused and misunderstood, partly because of the way in which it has been *malprinted*. But the methods of printing are not responsible for all of the trouble. A far greater cause of misunderstanding has been ignorance of the forms of literature employed by the biblical writers. Thus, to mention but a single phase of this, we all know how far short of their opportunities the Old Testament Company of Revisers fell in the matter of distinguishing poetry from prose. They disregarded the lessons taught by Herder, and Lowth, and Taylor, and Briggs. They were in this respect far behind the New Testament Company, so that we have in our Revised Version glaring inconsistencies in form between the Old Testament and the New, quotations from the Old Testament in the New appearing often as poetry in the latter, while in the former they are given as prose.

If the great distinction between poetry and prose has been so largely overlooked, we should hardly expect that the varieties of poetry and the different species of prose discourse should be distinguished. It is the task of exhibiting the varying forms of literature employed in the Bible that Professor Moulton has set himself. He has aimed to set forth a guide to the Bible as *literature*. And by so doing he has rendered a great service to the cause of sound exegesis. For a clue has already been gained to the meaning of a passage or a book when the literary form of that passage or book has been determined. We do not construe a rhapsody as we do a chronicle, nor a proverb as an elegy.

The book before us is made up as follows: An Introduction, consisting of a study of the Book of Job, in which the author finds illustrations of the drama, epic and lyric poetry, philosophy--mundane and transcendental, prophecy, rhetoric, and versification; then follow six "books" on literary classification applied to the Scriptures, Lyric Poetry of the Bible, Biblical History and Epic, The Philosophy of the Bible, Biblical Literature of Prophecy, The Biblical Literature of Rhetoric; there are also four appendices, which round out admirably the plan of the volume.

To the making of the book the author has brought clear insight. He has mastered, for instance, the principle of the refrain in Hebrew poetry, and in connection with this his statement of the need of textual emendation is sound, following Dr. Briggs in his Messianic Prophecy. He has set forth admirably the value of the application of parallelism in exegesis (pp. 68, 72), particularly in the (valid) distinction between the higher and the lower parallelism. Very catchy is his grouping of Psalms 78, 105, 106, 136 as "national anthems."

The work done is as a whole so good that it is a pity it is not better. The author has based his work on the English version. Consequently he has made generalizations and coined names and educed principles which have no basis in the original of the examples adduced. Thus, on page 55 his "stanzas of varying figures" is all right as based on the English. But while the lines

in our version run 1-2-3, 1-2-3, 1-2-3, 1-2-3-4, in the Hebrew they run 1-2-3, 2-3-1, 2-3-1, 2-1-3-4. Consequently Professor Moulton's pretty plan of a quatrain reversed does not apply as a principle of Hebrew poetry. So, too, his conception of the measures of lines is wrong. Thus, on page 50 he has given as quatrains what are couplets. On pages 114-116 he has printed as prose what should appear as poetry. His principle of the higher parallelism would by no means be injured; indeed, its beauty would be enhanced, notwithstanding his plea on page 117.

The treatment of Judges iv., v. should be put over against Professor Moore's in the Critical Commentary.

The author's coining of new phrases ("Dramatic monologue" we can understand; but what is "Rhetoric encomium"?), his use of old words in a new sense (*e.g.* "rhetoric" as "literature of address"—*i.e.*, epistle and oration), are confusing and affect unfavorably the clearness of the treatment.

Professor Moulton differentiates his work from that of the higher criticism. He does right so to do. But his distinction is wrong. Higher criticism includes the "literary study of the Bible," is not included by it; higher criticism, moreover, is not "mainly a historical analysis."

Despite these blemishes the work is not only exceedingly interesting, but most valuable. We believe it will increase very largely the effectiveness of every minister who will use it. And we should like to see it in the hand of every intelligent layman. Pastors can do the cause of truth a service by recommending it from the pulpit. If it should prove influential in leading to an edition of the Bible printed so as to present to the eye the difference in literary morphology, a vast service will have been rendered.

Perhaps we may hope that eventually the Bible will be printed in a form which, while it will not furnish so many proof texts for dogmatic theologians, will yet enable the mass of Bible readers to appreciate the great variety of literary form and, as a consequence, more of the wonderful beauty of our Book of Books.

The publishers have done their part well. There are few typographical errors, the binding is substantial, the paper is fairly good.

GEORGE W. GILMORE.

Bangor Theological Seminary.

BRIEF REVIEWS AND NOTES.

Christ's Idea of the Supernatural, by John H. Denison (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.), like Professor Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," seeks to show "the unity between the natural and the spiritual worlds" (p. 3). Unlike Professor Drummond, the author does not confine himself to the great facts of spiritual experience, but seeks to show the credibility of the distinctly miraculous element in the Scriptures by the analogy of the phenomena of modern hypnotism. The book contains many true and helpful thoughts, but their effect is unfortunately vitiated by an almost total lack of historical perspective. The attempt to set forth the teaching of Jesus in the terms of the Society for Psychical Research and of Mr. Hudson Taylor, will be as unlikely to satisfy the thoughtful student of the New Testament as the effort to make place for the Apocalypse of the Synoptists in the modern theory of evolution will be likely to satisfy the advocates of the latter. A few quotations will illustrate our meaning better than many words. "For evolution means not only consummation upward, but also the manifestation of that which is within, aye, and the descent also of the highest into the lowest; it means, moreover, a *sudden final* [*italics ours*] co-ordination, and the disclosure and separation of all that is unfit to survive, and the manifestation of all causes and the secrets of all hearts and the setting of all things in the light of life, which is the light of God" (p. 200)—this in connection with Christ's eschatology. "To the mind of Jesus the presence of God signified an objective organic embodiment of His person and character" (p. 87). "This brings us squarely to the question, What is perception, and what are the laws on which it is conditioned? For

just here it is that the whole issue lies between Jesus and the sceptic or agnostic" (p. 98). Of John iii. 5 we read: "The new birth is simply the organic culmination under Christ of an embryonic spiritual process, an earthly fact that had been developing from the first under the Hebrew prophets, and particularly under the baptism of John" (p. 100). And again (p. 142): "If Christ brought in a new birth, it was simply because identification with so perfect an embodiment as Himself completed the embryonic process of development, and ushered the soul into complete organic co-ordination with the spiritual world." One more, out of the many which might be added, must suffice. "So also this hypnotic law corresponds to Christ's great law of revelation through the subordination of the Logos to the Spirit; while the idea of the ghost or phantasm, being an actual projection or radiation of the personality, uniting in itself the transcendent element of the spirit and the material element of the Psyche, is singularly correspondent to Christ's idea (*sic*) of the radiated spirit which did to the disciples assume the phantasmal form of fiery tongues and to Jesus Himself the semblance of a dove" (p. 262).

The last few years have seen the publication of a good many books on Persia, and the world is in a fair way to know all that it needs to learn about that country. One of the latest books on the subject is called *Persian Life and Customs*. It is from the pen of Rev. S. G. Wilson, who has been for fifteen years connected with the missions carried on by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. He describes his book as "scenes and incidents of residence and travel in the land of the Lion and the Sun." It is not distinctively a missionary book, though it throws a vast deal of light upon the problems which face the missionary. It shows his environment, the discouragements and the encouragements with which he meets. To the missionary pastor—that is, the pastor who feels an interest in missions and who lives up to the demands which rest upon him—the book will be a source of information in the missionary meeting which he will search for in vain in

other places. It is a valuable compend. (New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. \$1.75.)—The first edition of Dr. Daniel Dorchester's *Christianity in the United States* appeared about seven years ago, being begotten of the spirit of Robert Baird's volume on "Religion in America," printed in 1856. A revised edition has appeared, in which use is made of the statistics of churches gathered in the census of 1890. Additions have been made in the chapter which deals with the "actual growth" of the evangelical Protestant denominations, and also in the appendix of statistics covering churches and immigration. When taken together with Carroll's "Religious Forces of the United States," in the American Church History series, Dr. Dorchester's work presents the essential facts in the history of Christianity in the United States in very satisfactory and complete fashion. The volume in hand is too well known to require special or detailed commendation. (New York: Hunt & Eaton. \$3.50.)—Elder Wolcott H. Littlejohn, of Battle Creek, Mich., is a defender of the doctrine of conditional immortality, and his views are presented in a little book called *Life Only in Christ*, which he publishes himself. His thesis is that "immortality is not a birthright, but a gift from God." He urges the acceptance of this view as a defence against the inroads upon the credibility of the Bible due to the repugnance engendered by the doctrine of future punishment. We can only give a couple of samples of his reasoning and exegesis. His book is made on the basis of the English Bible and Cruden's Concordance, for he says that while the words "soul" and "spirit" occur 1700 times, the words "immortal" and "immortality" occur but six times! and that they refer only to Jehovah. On the basis of Rom. ii. 6, 7, his reasoning is about as follows: Men do not seek for what they have; Paul represents *the good* as "seeking for glory, honor, and immortality, eternal life;" *ergo*, good men are not naturally possessed of eternal life, and *a fortiori*, bad men are in a worse case still, and "all men must be mortal by nature."—A volume by the late pastor of the Broad-

way Tabernacle in New York, the Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D.D., will be of interest. It is called *Questions of Modern Inquiry*, and it contains a series of discussions had on Sunday evenings in connection with a musical service in his church. The topics are quite varied, and they are treated in simple and straightforward fashion. The questions are such as are constantly arising in the minds of thoughtful youth, and as their discussion was found useful in the pulpit, a similar usefulness is hoped for them in printed form. We quote a few of the titles: What am I to think about God? about the Bible? Why not give up miracles? How far is the Bible inspired? If a religion, why not some other? (New York: Revell Co. \$1.25.)—The Rev. George V. Reichel, Ph.D., has attempted in a volume called *What Shall I Tell the Children?* to answer his own question by setting forth some thirty-seven "object-sermons and teachings." The bulk of the book is made up of stories from which useful morals may be drawn easily. We have read a number and found them well adapted to their purpose, but in the collection is one too ghastly for employment in any audience of refined people. It is a pity that it was allowed to mar a collection otherwise so good. (Revell Co. \$1.50.)—In order to commend a volume lately received to a large circle of readers, it is only necessary to state the subject and author: *The Soul Winner*, or how to lead sinners to the Saviour, by the late Charles H. Spurgeon. The volume contains the substance of a course of lectures prepared for delivery to the "Pastors' College," some addresses to Sunday-school teachers and other workers, and some sermons to Christians upon the practical duties of their profession as indicated in the title. The whole constitutes a valuable, practical, and useful book that serves as a noble memorial of a noble preacher. (Revell Co. \$1.25.)—Dr. Daniel Dorchester is known as a valiant defender of Christianity, and he is well awake to the possibilities within grasp. His latest publication is a useful little compilation, not of the highest order of merit perhaps, but nevertheless likely to prove useful to preachers and workers. It is called *Christianity Vin-*

dedicated by its Enemies, and in it the expressions of eminent unbelievers or indifferent persons are grouped under a number of heads, as follows : God and immortality ; Genuine historic basis of Christianity ; The transcendent character of Christianity as a religious system ; The divinity of Christianity ; Four leading vital doctrines ; The innermost central column of the Christian system vindicated by its enemies ; and Inferences. The whole is supplemented with a full index. (New York : Hunt & Eaton. 75 cents.)—Some years ago considerable interest was aroused by a course of lectures on geology delivered at the Plattsburg Summer School by the Rev. J. A. Zahm, Ph.D., Professor of Physics in the (Roman Catholic) University of Nôtre Dame in Montreal. Recently we have received a volume by the same writer, entitled *Evolution and Dogma*, in which he defends the doctrine of evolution, and brings it into accord with the tenets of his church. The book is pleasantly written, and it contains a large amount of scientific material. Attention may be called to it as a work out of the ordinary run, but at the same time it shows the trend of the times. It is divided into two parts : the first, positive, "Evolution, past and present ;" the second, apologetic, "Evolution and Dogma." (Chicago : D. H. McBride & Co. Pp. 461.)—The sub-title of a book by Rev. Everett S. Stackpole, D.D., on *Prophecy*, indicates that it is occupied with what is in many respects the more important function of the prophet ; "speaking for God," in sense of *forth-telling* instead of *fore-telling*. The analogy is used to set forth the duties of ministers who to-day bear relations to God and man as did those men of old. It is a high calling, and its treatment shows that what some called "lax" views in some regards do not react in relaxing the duties of the sacred office. (New York and Boston : Crowell & Co. Pp. 157.)—As is quite generally known, the founder of Girard College in Philadelphia made special prohibition against the admission of any Christian minister within the walls of that institution. It is with considerable interest that one takes up a volume containing addresses delivered before the boys at the college, and

also in the chapel of the House of Refuge. This volume is called *Last Words for my Young Hearers and Readers*, by B. B. Comegys, LL.D. It is just such a book as one could wish to find it to be, containing good, strong material, and solid, sound, and wise advice and counsel to those who stand in particular need of it. We wish the volume a continued course of success. (Revell Co. \$1.00.)—The name of W. J. Dawson is by no means unknown in the field of literature of the nobler sort, and it is with pleasure that we welcome a volume of his essays under the title *The Making of Manhood*. They are strong and virile, and they almost read themselves as the eye skims along the lines. In order to show the scope of the collection, the titles of some of the papers may be cited: The duty of right thinking; The power of the ideal; The power of purpose; The gains of drudgery; The empty mind; The ministry of books; A young man's religion, etc. (Crowell & Co.)—*Koroko* is the title of a delightful little volume by Lafcadio Hearn, the American who has lived long in Japan, and who has become enamored of the life and institutions of that land. The present volume contains "hints and echoes of Japanese inner life," so far as he has been able to catch them. He tells much that is apparently true of the country and of the spirit of its people, but that he is correct as to all that he pretends to reveal is quite open to question. Occasionally the author is guilty of utter philosophical(?) bosh, but in the main it is a charming book which he has sent forth, and it is one which those who are interested in Japanese missions would do well to read and ponder. No one will accuse the writer of over-much sympathy with either Christianity or Christian missions, and if he could but disabuse his mind of all prejudice, his work would be the better. (Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.25.)—A great many people recall with special pleasure the visit of Dr. Paton, the Apostle of the New Hebrides, to this country. A similar experience came to the Canadian Presbyterian Church in having for its moderator of General Assembly in 1895 one of its own number, who had labored for nearly a quarter of a century in the missionary

field, and who brought messages of encouragement *From Far Formosa*. His book, published with this title, is not only of great interest in itself, but it is timely. To some extent it is a sort of biography, but in the main it is an account of the country, its people, their manners, customs, and needs, and of the efforts put forth for their evangelization. The volume is illustrated with maps and pictures, and gives a good idea of the whole subject. (Revell Co. \$2.00.)

SUBJECT INDEX TO THEOLOGICAL PERIODICALS.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS RECORD.

Af. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	Meth. R. So.	Methodist Review, South (Quarterly.)
Am. Cath. Q. R.	American Catholic Quarterly Review.	Miss. H.	Missionary Herald.
Bapt. Q.	Baptist Quarterly Review.	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
Bib. Sac.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	New Chr. Q.	New Christian Quarterly.
Bib. W.	Biblical World.	New W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
Can. M. R.	Canadian Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	Our D.	Our Day.
Char. R.	Charities Review.	Prot. Ep. R.	Protestant Epis. Review.
Chr. L.	Christian Literature.	Pre. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Church Q. R.	Church Quarterly Review.	Presb. Q. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Ex.	Expositor.	Ref. Q.	Reformed Quarterly Review.
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	Sunday M.	Sunday Magazine.
Hom. R.	Homiletic Review.	Treas.	The Treasury.
Luth. C. R.	Lutheran Church Review.	Yale R.	The Yale Review. (Quarterly.)
Luth. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.		
Meth. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)		

Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the June number of periodicals.

Abraham. (R. W. Dale) Ex.
Abyssinian church. (G. H. Schodde) Treas.
Abyssinians and their church. (G. H. Schodde) Miss. R.
Acoustic properties? Have audience rooms proper. (J. C. Ambrose) Hom. R.
Adventists, Friends, and others. (C. H. Small) Treas.
Africa, central, Recent progress in. (C. J. Laffin) Miss. R.
Africa, Paul's missionary methods in (R. Taylor) Treas.
African slave-traders, Further overthrows of. (J. Johnston) Miss. R.
Agricultural banks. Char. R. (Apr.).
Alden, Edmund K. Miss. H.
American Bible Society. (R. J. Bigham) Meth. R. So.
Anabaptist sect, Oriental. (A. H. Newman) Chr. L.
Arbitration, International. (J. B. Moore) New W.
Armenia, Martyrdom of. (C. Hamlin) Miss. R.
Armenia and its place in Christendom. (H. M. Du Bose) Meth. R. So.
Arnold, Matthew, Letters of. (R. E. Blackwell) Meth. R. So.
Arnold's, Matthew, letters. (M. Reed) New W.
Augustine and the Pelagian controversy. (B. B. Warfield) Chr. L.

- Balfour** and his critics. (T. R. Slicer) NewW.
Banqueting house, In the. (M. G. Pearse) Pre.M.
Bible Society, American. (R. J. Bigham) Meth.R.So.
Buddhism, Nine centuries of. (F. B. Shawe) Miss.R.
Burke, Edmund. (T. W. Hunt) Treas.
Canaan, Land of. (J. F. McCurdy) Hom.R.
Charities and corrections in the University of Wisconsin, Method of teaching. (E. D. Jones) Char.R. (Apr.).
Charity, Organized: the kind that Paul forgot. (W. McIntosh) Char.R. (Apr.).
Charles, Elizabeth Rundle, Hymns of. (J. H. Ross) Hom.R.
China since the late war. (E. R. Hendrix) Meth.R.So.
Christ in the world's thought. (H. W. Featherstun) Meth.R.So.
Christian Endeavor movement, Symposium on the. (F. E. Clark) Hom.R.
Codex, New purple. (A. L. Long) Chr.L.
Coillard, Madame. (A. Bertrand) Miss.R.
David's Son and David's Lord. (J. Denney) Ex.
Deluge, Biblical account of the. (J. W. Dawson) Hom.R.
Divine evolution. (H. Macmillan) Chr.L.
Divine power harnessed. (E. T. Lee) Treas.
Evolution, Divine. (H. Macmillan) Chr.L.
Evolution, Limits of. (G. H. Howison) NewW.
Faith, Unity of. (W. E. Barton) Treas.
Flower sermon. (F. W. Farrar) Pre.M.
Friends. (C. H. Small) Treas.
Glenn, John. (D. C. Gilman) Char.R. (Apr.).
Hapax Legomena of St. Paul. (W. P. Workman) Ex.T.
Haygood, Atticus Greene. (O. P. Fitzgerald) Meth.R.So.
"Herzog" New. (J. G. Tasker) Ex.T.
Holiness, Growth in, Dr. Mudge on. (J. C. Granbery) Meth.R.So.
"Hustling minister," Young people's. Chr.L.
Japan, Prison reform in. (W. W. Curtis) Miss.H.
Jesus mirrored in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. (A. B. Bruce) Ex.
Las Casas and democracy. (C. C. Starbuck) NewW.
Literature on the New Testament, Survey of. (M. Dods) Ex.
Madagascar, Recent war in. (W. E. Cousins) Miss.R.
Manning, Cardinal (St. G. Mivart) NewW.
Methodism, Making of. (J. J. Tigert) Meth.R.So.
Missionary sermon. (C. P. Cadman) Pre.M.
Mizraim or Muzri. (J. Taylor) Ex.T.
Monroe doctrine in the light of history. (T. J. Dodd) Meth.R.So.
New Testament, Survey of literature on the. (M. Dods) Ex.
Opinion, errors of, How far are men responsible for. (E. F. Burr) Hom.R.
Paul knew. (F. Almy) Char.R. (Apr.).
Paul's missionary methods in Africa. (R. Taylor) Treas.
Pope, Reflective poetry of. (T. W. Hunt) Hom.R.
Prison reform in Japan. (W. W. Curtis) Miss.H.
Protestantism, Liberal, in France. (G. Bonet-Maury) Chr.L.
Psalms, Theology of the. (W. T. Davison) Ex.T.
Religious forces of the United States. (H. K. Carroll) Chr.L.
S. Francis de Sales: doctor of the church. Chr.L.
Sanday, William. (J. V. Bartlett) Chr.L.

Satan, Activity of. (C. T. Wilson) Treas.
Sinners, Condition of. Pre.M.
Sixth hour. (W. M. Ramsay) Ex.
Social structure of a western town. (A. W. Dunn) Char.R. (Apr.).
Social subjects, Relation of the preacher to. (J. W. Day) NewW.
Sociology, General and criminal. (C. R. Henderson) Char.R. (Apr.).
Trinitarianism, New England. (L. L. Paine) NewW.
United States, Some later histories of the. (W. J. Vaughn) Meth.R.So.
Van, Relief work at. Miss.H.
Wealth, Social function of. Char.R. (Apr.).
Wellhausen and Dr. Baxter. (A. S. Peake) Ex.T.
Wendt's untranslated volume on the teaching of Jesus. (J. Stalker) Ex.
Will to believe. (W. James) NewW.
World kingdoms, Relation of the, to the kingdom of God. (A. T. Pierson) Miss.R.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

Charities Review.

Galesburg, April, 1896.

The kind that Paul forgot.
 Paul knew.
 Agricultural banks.
 Social function of wealth.
 Method of teaching charities and correction in the University of Wisconsin.
 Outlook in Chicago.
 General sociology and criminal sociology.
 John Glenn.
 Analysis of the structure of a western town.

Christian Literature.

New York, June, 1896.

Augustine and the Pelagian controversy.
 S. Francis de Sales: doctor of the church.
 William Sanday.
 Divine evolution.
 New purple codex.
 Liberal Protestantism in France.
 Oriental Anabaptist sect.
 Young people's "hustling minister."

Religious forces of the United States.

The Expositor.

London, June, 1896.

Wendt's untranslated volume on the teaching of Christ.
 Jesus mirrored in Matthew, Mark, and Luke.
 Abraham.
 David's Son and David's Lord.
 Sixth hour.
 Survey of literature on the New Testament.

Expository Times.

Edinburgh, June, 1896.

Theology of the Psalms.
 Great texts of St. John's Gospel.
 Wellhausen and Dr. Baxter.
 Mizraim or Muzri.
 New "Herzog."
 Hapax Legomena of St. Paul.

The Homiletic Review.

New York, June, 1896.

Natural facts illustrative of the biblical account of the deluge.

How far are men responsible for errors of opinion?

Symposium on the Christian Endeavor movement.

Reflective poetry of Pope.

Land of Canaan.

Hymns of Elizabeth Rundle Charles.

In a horn; or, have audience rooms proper acoustic properties?

Methodist Review.

Nashville, May-June, 1896.

Bishop Atticus Greene Haygood. Some later histories of the United States.

Letters of Matthew Arnold.

Dr. Mudge on growth in holiness. Armenia and its place in Christendom.

China since the late war.

Monroe doctrine in the light of history.

American Bible Society.

Christ in the world's thought.

Making of Methodism.

The Missionary Herald.

Boston, June, 1896.

Edmund K. Alden.

Prison reform in Japan.

Relief work at Van.

Suggested program for missionary concert for July, 1896.

Missionary Review.

New York, June, 1896.

Twofold relation of the world kingdoms to the kingdom of God.

Recent progress in Central Africa.

Nine centuries of Buddhism.

Recent war in Madagascar and some of its consequences.

Martyrdom of Armenia.

Abyssinians and their church.

Further overthrows of African slave-traders.

Missionary heroine — Madame Coillard.

The New World.

Boston, June, 1896.

Cardinal Manning.

International arbitration.

Limits of evolution.

Matthew Arnold's letters.

New England trinitarianism.

Relation of the preacher to social subjects.

Las Casas and democracy.

Mr. Balfour and his critics.

The will to believe.

Preacher's Magazine.

New York, June, 1896.

Missionary sermon.

Life indeed.

In the banqueting house.

Flower sermon.

Condition of sinners.

Homiletics.

The Treasury.

New York, June, 1896.

St. Paul's missionary methods in Africa.

Divine power harnessed.

Unity of faith.

Activity of Satan.

Adventists, Friends, and others.

Abyssinian church.

Edmund Burke.

LITERARY NOTES.

THE *Bookman* says: "Some parts of Ecclesiasticus have recently been discovered by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, of Cambridge. During a journey in Egypt and Palestine, from which they have just returned, they purchased a number of stray leaves of manuscripts, chiefly Hebrew.

Among them was a little paper leaf, very dirty and ragged at the foot, which Mr. Schechter, the University reader in Talmudic, has identified as from the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus. Mr. Schechter has copied nearly all that is on the leaf, and it is hoped that the few words he has not yet deciphered will soon yield to chemical persuasion. The text will be published in an early number of the *Expositor*. It will be remembered that Professor Margoliouth, in his inaugural lecture, delivered at Oxford five years ago, tried a reconstruction of some of its passages from the versions, and expressed the opinion that the accomplishment of this feat, whether by himself or by others, would prove of great value in ascertaining the dates of several books of the Old Testament."

THE Rev. E. Cyril Gordon has translated the "Pilgrim's Progress" into Luganda, and if it is published it will bring the number of languages in which the immortal work has been printed up to eighty-nine. Mr. G. L. Pilkington has also prepared a controversial work for use in Uganda, where Romanists, after their fashion, are making a virtue of necessity and using the New Testament to serve their ends.

Two more parts of Professor Haupt's polychromatic edition of the Hebrews Scriptures—"Genesis," by the Rev. Charles Ball; and "Ezra" and "Nehemiah," by Professor Guthe—may be expected immediately. Professor Kamphausen's "Daniel" is nearly completed, and Canon Cheyne's "Isaiah," and Professor Toy's "Ezekiel" may be looked for in the course of the summer.

MR. JUSTIN MCCARTHY has written a volume on the Pope for

Messrs. Bliss, Sands & Foster's "Public Men of To-day" Series.

THE biography of the late Sir Joseph Barnby has been entrusted to Mr. W. H. Sonley Johnstone, and will be published this year by Mr. H. Weinemann. Friends of the composer are invited to enter into communication with the editor, at the offices of the publisher, 21 Bedford Street, and to forward any letters or reminiscences that may be useful in the compilation of the work.

THE house in which Zwingli was born at Wildhaus is to be sold to the president of a committee in Zurich, who have undertaken to repair it, and to keep it in good condition. The birthplace of Zwingli surely deserves as much honor as the house of John Knox in Edinburgh, or the famous shrines of Luther.

MAGAZINES.

LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for July contains: "A Judicial Error," Marion Manville Pope; "Decadence of Modern Russian Literature," A Russian; "A Twenty-Dollar Bill," Algernon Tassin; "Pennsylvania and her Public Men," Sydney G. Fisher; "My Rural Experiences," Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen; "The Rector's Game-cock," Gillam W. Ford; "The Southern Ideal," Annie Steger Winston; "On Being Fond of One's Thoughts," John Sheridan Zelig; "An Old Story," Jean Wright; "Yankee Doodle," Caroline T. Bansemer.

THE contents of SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE for July are: "Coney Island," Julian Ralph; "De Profundis," Rosamund Marriott Watson; "On the Poetry of Place Names," Brander Matthews; "A Thousand Miles through the

Alps," Sir W. Martin Conway; "Sentimental Tommy," J. M. Barrie; "Ars et Vita," T. R. Sullivan; "A New Art," J. Carter Beard; "In Collusion with Fate," Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen; "Some Portraits of J. M. W. Turner," Cosmo Monkhouse; "Renunciation," Louise Betts Edwards; "The Confession of Colonel Sylvester," Clinton Ross; "A French Friend of Browning—Joseph Milsand," Th. Bentzon (Madame Blanc); "The Hidden Valley," Charles Edwin Markham; "Do They Measure Time Where Thou Art?" Julia C. R. Dorr.

THE contents of July CENTURY are: "St. Peter's," F. Marion Crawford; "Becalmed," L. Frank Tooker; "Old Lady Lazenberry," Richard Malcolm

Johnston; "Night in the Redwoods," Clarence Urmay; "An Open-eyed Conspiracy. An Idyll of Saratoga," William Dean Howells; "Glimpses of Venezuela and Guiana," W. Nephew King; "Rosemary," Edmund Gosse; "The Pot of Frightful Doom," Chester Bailey Fernald; "Life of Napoleon Bonaparte," William M. Sloane; "Mine Enemy," Clinton Scollard; "An Arctic Studio (77° 44' N. Lat.)," Frank Wilbert Stokes; "Captive," Harriet Prescott Spofford; "A Family Record of Ney's Execution," Madame Campan; "Sir George Tressady," Mrs. Humphry Ward; "Impressions of South Africa," James Bryce, M.P.; "A Comedy of War," Frank Pope Humphrey; "Recollections and Anecdotes of Bulow," Bernard Boekelman.

CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY PROFESSOR GEORGE W. GILMORE, A.M.

CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 10th.)

May 8.—Ninety-seventh Anniversary of the (British) *Religious Tract Society*, in London.

May 9-10.—May Meetings of the *London Missionary Society*, in London.

May 10.—Seventy-second Anniversary of the *American Sunday-School Union*, in New Haven, Conn.

May 12.—Annual Meeting of the *Woman's Board of Missions, Reformed (Dutch) Church*, in New York City.

May 12-14.—Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the *United Presby-*

terian Women's General Missionary Society, at Erie, Pa.

May 13-14.—Twenty-seventh Annual Convention of the *Woman's Centenary Association* (Woman's National Missionary Association of the Universalist Church), in Stamford, Conn.

May 14.—Spring session of the *English Congregational Union*, in London.

Thirty-first Anniversary of the *National Temperance Society and Publication House*, in New York City.

Annual Meeting of the *American*

Tract Society, in New York City.

May 15.—Quadrennial Conference of the *Methodist Protestant Church*, in Kansas City, Kan.

May 17.—Seventh Anniversary of the Founding of the *Epworth League*.

Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the *Cumberland Presbyterian Woman's Board of Missions*, in Memphis, Tenn.

May 18-26.—*Baptist Anniversaries*, at Asbury Park, N. J., as follows:

May 18.—*Women's Home Mission Society*.

May 20.—*Publication Society*.

May 22.—*Missionary Union*.

May 25.—*Home Mission Society*.

May 21.—One Hundred and Eighth General Assembly of the *Presbyterian Church, United States of America*, at Saratoga.

General Assembly of the *Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, at Birmingham, Ala.

General Assembly of the *Presbyterian Church in the United States* (South), in Memphis, Tenn.

May 25-30.—*Unitarian Anniversary Week*, in Boston.

May 27.—Delivery of the *Romanes Lecture* at Oxford, by the *Bishop of Peterborough*, on "English National Character."

May 27.—Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the *United Presbyterian Church*, at Xenia, O.

May 28.—One Hundred and Forty-ninth Convention of the *Evangelical Lutheran Minis-*

terium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States, at Allentown, Pa.

May 31-June 4.—Annual Meetings of the *National British Women's Temperance Association*, in London.

June 2-3.—*English Clerical and Lay Evangelical Conference*, at Southport.

June 2-4.—Eightieth Anniversary of the *Congregational College and Educational Society*, in Boston.

Seventieth Anniversary of the *Congregational Home Missionary Society*.

June 3.—Session of the Synod of the (Dutch) *Reformed Church in America*, in Catskill, N. Y.

June 4-5.—Summer Meeting of the *Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, in New Haven.

June 4-10.—Twenty-third Annual Meeting of the *National Conference of Charities and Corrections*, at Grand Rapids, Mich.

June 5-9.—Annual Conference of *General Secretaries* of the *Young Men's Christian Association*, in Cleveland, O.

June 8.—Fourth *Missionary Congress* of the Synod of New York, at Buffalo, N. Y.

The *Rev. William H. Roberts, D.D.*, of Philadelphia, has been elected *chairman* of the *American* section of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System.

The *Methodist Episcopal General Conference* made the following appointments: *Rev.*

Homer Eaton, D.D., and *Rev. H. Mains, D.D.*, *Book Agents* in New York; and *Rev. Abram*

J. Palmer, D.D., and *Rev. William T. Smith, D.D.*, *Missionary Secretaries*.

EPISCOPALIAN.

The Rev. John Glennon, D.D., has been appointed (Roman Catholic) *Coadjutor* to the Bishop of Kansas City.

The Rev. John Philip Du Moulin, M.A., D.C.L., has been elected Bishop of Niagara, Canada.

Bishop Henry Mueller, President of the Moravian Unity's Elder's Conference, has resigned.

The General Conference of the

African Methodist Episcopal Church has elected three bishops: *William B. Derrick, D.D.*, of New York; *J. A. Armstrong, D.D.*, of Texas; and *J. C. Embry, D.D.*, of Missouri.

The *Methodist Episcopal General Conference* has retired *Bishops Bowman, Foster, and Taylor*, and elected in their places the *Rev. Charles C. McCabe, D.D.*, the *Rev. Earl W. Cranston, D.D.*, and the *Rev. J. C. Hartzell*.

EDUCATIONAL—COLLEGES.

The *Rev. R. H. Roberts, B.A.*, has resigned the Principalship of *Regent's Park College*, London.

The *Rev. E. K. Chandler, D.D.*, has resigned the Presidency

of *Clinton College*, Kentucky.

The *Rev. J. D. Robnett, D.D.*, has resigned the Presidency of *Howard Payne College* at Brownwood, Tex.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The *Rev. James Spurgeon, D.D.*, has resigned the Presidency of the *Pastor's College* of the London Tabernacle.

The *Rev. Charles M. Stuart, D.D.*, has been elected to fill the new chair of *Sacred Rhetoric* in *Garrett Biblical Institute*; and the *Rev. Solon*

C. Bronson is to take the chair of *Pastoral Theology* in the same institution.

The *Rev. Henry Goodwin Smith*, son of the late Professor Henry B. Smith, of Union Seminary, has been elected Professor of Theology in *Lane Theological Seminary*, Cincinnati.

OBITUARY.

Alden, Rev. Edmund Kimball (Congregationalist), *D.D.* (Amherst College, 1860), in Boston, April 30, aged 71. Dr. Alden was a descendant, in the sev-

enth generation, of John Alden, who came over in the Mayflower; he was born at Randolph, Mass.; fitted for college at Randolph Academy; was

graduated from Amherst College, 1844; taught a year in Williston Seminary; was graduated from Andover Theological Seminary, 1848; ordained at Yarmouth, Me., 1850; became pastor at Lenox, Mass., 1854; called to charge of Phillips Church, South Boston, 1859; elected Secretary for the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1876; refused re-election, 1893. In his work for the Board he was Corresponding Secretary for the Home Department. He was strongly conservative in type of thought and action, and retired when the more liberal action of the Board was decided upon. But that he cherished enmity is decidedly disproved by the provisions of his will, by which he made the Board a sharer in his savings.

Moore, Rev. Halsey (Baptist), *D.D.* (Madison University), in Newark, N. J., May 16, aged 52. He was born in New York City; studied for the ministry at Madison University (now Colgate University); was ordained at Cold Spring Harbor, L. I., 1865; subsequently removed to the pastorate at Bangall, near Poughkeepsie; became pastor of the church at One Hundred and Eleventh Street, New York, 1871; was elected Secretary for New York State for the Home Missionary Society, 1889, and held that office at his death.

Murphy, Rev. James Gracey (Irish Presbyterian), *D.D.* (Trinity College, Dublin, 1842), *LL.D.* (Trinity College, Dublin, 1880), in Belfast, Ireland, April 19, aged 88. He was born at Ballyaltikilikan, County Down; was graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, 1833; became minister at Ballyshan-

non, 1836; classical head master at the Royal Belfast Academical Institution, 1841; Professor of Hebrew, Presbyterian College, Belfast, 1847; retired from active work, 1888. While he was noted as a linguist, he came into notice as a mathematician. He was the author of *Commentaries on Exodus, Leviticus, Chronicles, Psalms, Daniel*, and the *Apocalypse*, all of which, except the last, were republished in the United States, and are not yet antiquated, though published long ago. He wrote also a *Latin Grammar* and a *Hebrew Grammar*, and a work on the *Human Mind*.

Reid, Rev. John Morison (Methodist Episcopal), *D.D.*, in New York City, May 16, aged 76. He was graduated from New York University, 1839, and after teaching, pursued a course of theology in Union College; entered the ministry in New York Conference, 1844; served successively in Connecticut, at Jamaica, L. I., Middletown, and Seventh Street, New York; became pastor of Summerfield Church, Brooklyn, 1855, going thence to Bridgeport, Conn.; was elected president of Genesee College, 1858; was elected editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, 1864, and of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, 1868; became a secretary of the missionary society, 1872; was chosen honorary secretary, 1888, retiring from active work on account of feeble health. He bought and presented to Syracuse University the Von Ranke library.

Bacone, Rev. A. C. (Baptist), *D.D.*, president of the Indian University, at Muscogee, I. T., April 22.

- Bradley, Rev. Charles F.* (Unitarian), in Quincy, Ill., May 7, aged 56.
- Conrad, Rev. Jacob E.* (Presbyterian), at Blue Earth City, Minn., May 6, aged 82.
- Hubbell, Rev. James W.* (Congregational), at Mansfield, O., May 19, aged 62.
- Noble, Rev. Jonathan Henry* (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, at Perth Amboy, N. J., Apr. 26, aged 92.
- Pritchard, Rev. Thomas Henderson* (Baptist), *D.D.*, in New York, May 23, aged 63.
- Raine, Rev. Chancellor* (Anglican), *D.C.L.* (Durham University, 1882), in York, England, May 20. He edited many volumes of the Surtees Society publications.
- Rinkel, Rev. Kaspar John* (Old Catholic Bishop), at Haarlem, May 2.
- Stacpoole, George Stanislaus de* (Roman Catholic), *Mgr.*, in Rome, Italy, Mar. 16. He was domestic Prelate of the Pope.
- Stocking, Rev. Sabura Stebbins* (Protestant Episcopal), in Jamaica, L. I., May 24, aged 86.
- Thayer, Rev. Peter Blake* (Congregational), in Garland, Me., May 25, aged 80. He had been pastor in Garland forty-eight years.
- Thomas, Rev. Charles F.* (Presbyterian), *D.D.*, in Philadelphia, Apr. 29, aged 50.
- Thompson, Rev. J. L.* (United Presbyterian), *D.D.*, in Denver, Col., May 16, aged 45.

CALENDAR.

[The compiler will welcome notices of meetings of general importance and interest, provided such notices reach him before the 10th of the month prior to that in which the meetings are to take place. Exact dates and names of places, when and where the meetings are to be held, are desired.]

- June 30-July 4.—Tenth International Conference of the *Evangelical Alliance*, in celebration of the Jubilee of the Alliance, in connection with the *Mildmay Conference*, in Exeter Hall and Mildmay Hall, London.
- July 1-Aug. 24.—Continuance of the *Chautauqua Assembly*, at Chautauqua, N. Y.
- July 1-Sept. 22.—Summer School of the *University of Chicago*.
- July 3-13.—International Methodist Episcopal *Camp Meeting*, at Mountain Lake Park, near Washington, D. C.
- July 6-10.—Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the *National Education Society*, at Buffalo, N. Y.
- July 6-Aug. 24.—*School for Systematic Bible Study*, Northfield, Mass.
- July 7-10.—*National Education Association*, at Buffalo, N. Y.
- July 7-11.—Tenth Annual Conference of *Christians of all Nations*, under the auspices of the British Evangelical Alliance, in London.
- July 7-28.—*Canadian Summer School*, at Kingston, Ont.

- July 8-13.—Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the United Societies of *Christian Endeavor*, at Washington, D. C.
- July 10-20.—*Young Women's Conference* under the auspices of the Young Women's Christian Association, at Northfield.
- July 12-Aug. 16.—*Catholic Summer School*, at Plattsburgh, N. Y.
- July 13-24.—Series of Lectures for *Clergy of Anglican and Affiliated Churches*, in Durham University, England.
- July 13-Aug. 10.—*Colorado Summer School of Philosophy*, at Colorado Springs.
- July 16-19.—Sixth International Convention of the *Baptist Young People's Union Association*, at Milwaukee.
- Epworth League* Convention of the Second General Conference District, at Ocean Grove, N. J.
- July 19-Aug. 4.—*Columbian Catholic Summer School*, in Madison, Wis.
- July 20.—Opening of the *Young Women's College Conference*, at Northfield.
- July 20-21.—National *Deaconess Convention*, at Ocean Grove, N. J.
- July 20-Aug. 1.—*New England Assembly*, at Lakeview.
- July 21-23.—Annual Meeting of the *Welsh Congregational Union*, at Bridgend, Glamorganshire.
- July 22-Aug. 2.—*Baptist Assembly of Christian Summer Schools*, at Pine Lake, Ind.
- July 23.—Annual *Pen-Mar Lutheran Reunion*.
- July 23-Aug. 17.—*Christian Baptist Bethany Assembly Encampment*.
- July 24-29.—National *Woman's Christian Temperance Union School of Methods*, at Mountain Lake Park.
- July 30-Aug. 2.—Reunion of the *United States Christian Commission*, at Mountain Lake Park.
- July 30-Aug. 12.—General *Conference for Bible Study*, at Northfield.
- Aug. 1-2.—*Methodist Episcopal Woman's Foreign Missionary Association*, at Mountain Lake Park.
- Aug. 3-10.—Fifteenth National *Universalist Summer Meeting*, at Weirs, Lake Winnepesaukee, N. H.
- Aug. 3-15.—General Conference of *Christian Workers*, at Northfield, Mass.
- Aug. 5-25.—Methodist Episcopal *Mountain Chautauqua*, at Mountain Lake Park.
- Aug. 9-13.—*Catholic International Scientific Congress*, at Fribourg, Switzerland.
- Aug. 19-24.—Institute of the United Presbyterian *Young People's Christian Union*, in Omaha.
- Aug. 23-30.—Biblical Assembly of the *American Society of Religious Education*, at Mountain Lake Park.
- Aug. 24.—Closing exercises of the *Chautauqua School*.

Christian Literature

*A Monthly Review of
Religious Thought and Movement*

30 Cents a Number \$3.00 a Year

*Advertising Rates on Application
Address all Communications to*

The Christian Literature Co.
NEW YORK

JULY, 1896.

A Compact Machine.

THE Cray Typewriter, mention of which was made in this department in May, bears but slight resemblance to any of the standard typewriters in use, weighing but ten pounds, and being built on simple and compact lines. The keyboard is disk-shaped, and contains 80 celluloid keys, the arrangement of which brings those keys striking vowels and other much-used letters and characters immediately under the hands of the operator. A noticeable feature, also, is the ribbon attachment for writing with ink of any desired color. The removal of a black ribbon, for instance, and the substitution of a red, purple, or green ribbon is accomplished with both ease and celerity. The machine will receive a book of any required width or thickness, will write a line long or short, and is so devised that the distance between lines may be scaled to suit the amount of space at hand or the fancy of the operator.

GRADUATING from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, in New York, in 1846, Dr. Hunter

has for forty years been the sole exponent of the germ theory of consumption. He has been engaged in active research in this field for over fifty years.

This germ theory is now the accepted doctrine throughout the world. But it was not until forty years after that Dr. Hunter proclaimed it in the *Specialist* that its indisputable truth was established by finding the particular germ that causes consumption in the sputum and tissues of the lungs of those afflicted, and thus demonstrated how superior was Dr. Hunter's judgment and knowledge of this disease.

THROUGH MESSRS. Hodder & Stoughton, Archdeacon Sinclair is about to publish an important and comprehensive work on "Leaders of Thought in the English Church." The leaders are twelve—namely, Cranmer, Latimer, Laud, Hooker, Butler, Waterland, Wesley, Simeon, Newman, Pusey, Arnold, and Tait.

Reduced Rates to Washington.

THE Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor will hold their Annual Meeting in Washington, D. C., July 7th to 13th.

For this occasion the B. & O. R. R. Co. will sell tickets, from all points on its lines, east of the Ohio River to Washington, at one single fare for the round trip, July 6th to 8th inclusive; valid for return passage until July 15th inclusive, with the privilege of an additional extension until July 31st by depositing tickets with Joint Agent at Washington.

Tickets will also be on sale at stations of all connecting lines.

Delegates should not lose sight of the fact that all B. & O. trains run *via* Washington.